

tion amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9016. Also, petition of E. P. George, C. G. Koerner, A. E. Snair, L. G. Gohogan, George Waddington, A. J. Kuhn, Paul J. Trout, of New Kensington, Pa., urging support of the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1932

(Legislative day of Thursday, December 8, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar days of Tuesday, December 13, Wednesday, December 14, and Thursday, December 15, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kean	Schall
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Schuyler
Bailey	Dickinson	Keyes	Shipstead
Bankhead	Dill	King	Shortridge
Barbour	Fess	La Follette	Smith
Barkley	Frazier	Logan	Smoot
Bingham	George	Long	Steiwer
Black	Glass	McGill	Swanson
Blaine	Goldsborough	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gore	McNary	Trammell
Broussard	Grammer	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulkley	Hale	Moses	Vandenberg
Bulow	Harrison	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Hastings	Norbeck	Walcott
Capper	Hatfield	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Hayden	Patterson	Watson
Coolidge	Hebert	Reed	White
Copeland	Howell	Reynolds	
Costigan	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained on official business.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] are detained by reason of illness.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is detained by illness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is necessarily absent by reason of illness.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FOREIGN DEBTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on yesterday I gave notice that to-day I intended to discuss the foreign debt situation. Since making that announcement there has been, in my opinion, some change in the trend of events. Certain circumstances have arisen which I hope will work to the mutual advantage of both France and the United States and preserve the fine and friendly and cordial relationship that always has existed between the two countries. Therefore, it is my opinion that the wise thing to do at this time, in view of that situation, is to withhold any remarks touching that very important question, and so I shall conduct myself accordingly for the present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13520) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the debate on the pending bill, it seems to me, has proceeded far enough to justify the imposition of a limitation by unanimous consent. It will be recalled that during the last session the bill and amendments to it were discussed for a period of a week or 10 days. It has been the sole subject of consideration since the present session began. A number of tentative agreements have been reached. I feel that with the approval of those in charge of the bill and other Senators who have been interested in important amendments a proposal for limitation should be submitted.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and each amendment and motion relating to the same be limited, so that hereafter no Senator may speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes on the bill or any amendment thereto or any motion pertaining to the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator limit the request to the pending motion? We do not know what other amendments may be proposed, and there may be some that would require considerable debate. May not the request be limited at this time to the pending motion? That will probably determine the fate of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator objects or if he indicates an intention to object, I will withdraw the request. I shall renew it a little later.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as I understand it, there is no objection to the request so far as it relates to the pending question. Let us go as far as we can. If there is no objection to limiting debate on the pending motion, let us dispose of that and then see what the situation is.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In view of the suggestions of the two Senators from Louisiana, while I am not certain that very much will be accomplished by imposing a limitation of debate on the amendment, which has already been debated, and the pending motion, on which I understand the Senate is about ready to vote, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending motion be limited so that no Senator may speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes.

Mr. DILL. That has reference to the pending motion to reconsider?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the motion to reconsider. That is the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] to reconsider the vote whereby the

amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] was agreed to.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37 of the committee amendment, strike out all after line 7 to and including the word "report" in line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act.

So as to read:

SEC. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act the President of the United States shall withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands and, on behalf of the United States, shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof under the constitution then in force: *Provided*, That the constitution has been previously amended to include the following provisions:

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I wish to make just a few remarks to meet the objections which have been urged by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I have had some one assembled some figures as to the indebtedness of the Philippine Islands. The amount of that indebtedness is now \$66,000,000. Annual payments on those obligations are being made at the rate of \$4,749,155. That is the estimate of the Philippine liabilities as found in the hearings of the committee of the other House. Computing those payments on the basis of 10 years under the 8-year limitation, they will amount to \$47,000,000.

It will be found from the House hearings that the importations from the Philippines according to the figures for 1930 aggregated \$105,882,682. If those who want to provide for the bonded indebtedness will impose during the last three years of the 8-year period, duties of, say, 5, 10, and 15 per cent there will be raised \$31,766,000. Under such a plan the surplus, after the payment of the Philippine indebtedness, will be \$13,257,518, which will accrue for the benefit of the Philippine Islands; and mind you, Mr. President, I am not considering the \$50,000,000 that are now on deposit in the United States Government for the redemption of Philippine bonds.

If that be the problem to be solved, I submit to the Senate that under the 8-year plan there can be raised more than enough to pay all the indebtedness plus \$13,257,178, and retain to the credit of the Philippine Islands about \$50,000,000 on deposit now in the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am not sure that I understand the Senator with respect to the amount which he claims is on deposit in the United States, to wit, \$50,000,000. My understanding is that that amount is not for the purpose of meeting the bond obligations of the Philippine Islands, but is for the purpose of protecting the currency which has been issued by the Philippines, and which is in circulation in those islands. In other words, it is the gold cover or the metallic cover upon which is based the currency which has been issued by the Philippine government, and to use any part of the \$50,000,000 in liquidation of the bonded indebtedness would, of course, impair the credit of the Philippines. It would result in a diminution in the value of the currency of the country for exchange purposes if not for domestic purposes. I think the Senator is in error in assuming that that \$50,000,000 is available for the discharge of the bonded indebtedness.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think the Senator from Utah misunderstood me, or else I did not express myself properly.

The deposits of the Philippine government in the United States are not figured in this computation at all. There is a surplus of over \$13,000,000 outside of such deposits, as set forth in the statement from which I have read.

I said that it did not take into consideration the \$50,000,000. The \$50,000,000, as I understand, will play no part in the redemption of the Philippine bonds, and I merely made the reference as a side statement. However, my understanding is that 15 per cent of that is considered as a gold reserve to guarantee the Philippine currency, and not \$50,000,000; but, be that as it may, a surplus is shown without considering it at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROUSSARD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEBERT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I find, however, that I can transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. I do so, and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Not knowing his views upon this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON]. These two Senators are paired on this question, and I am informed that if the Senator from Iowa were present, he would vote "nay"; and that if the Senator from New Mexico were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARBOUR. I have a pair on this vote with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. Not knowing how she would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask to be recorded as "present."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to announce that on this question the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD], who is absent in attendance upon the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas, is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. FESS. I was requested to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

I wish further to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—42

Ashurst	Dale	Hebert	Reed
Austin	Fess	Hull	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Glass	Johnson	Smith
Barkley	Goldsborough	Kendrick	Steiwer
Bingham	Gore	Keyes	Tydings
Blaine	Grammer	La Follette	Wagner
Borah	Hale	Logan	Walcott
Bulkeley	Harrison	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Bulow	Hastings	McNary	Walsh, Mont.
Coolidge	Hawes	Metcalf	
Cutting	Hayden	Patterson	

NAYS—34

Bankhead	Carey	Dill	Kean
Black	Cohen	Frazier	King
Broussard	Costigan	George	Long
Byrnes	Couzens	Hatfield	McGill
Capper	Dickinson	Howell	Moses

Neely
Norbeck
Nye
Oddie

Reynolds
Robinson, Ind.
Schall
Schuyler

Shipstead
Smoot
Thomas, Okla.
Trammell

Watson
White

NOT VOTING—20

Barbour
Bratton
Brookhart
Caraway
Connally

Copeland
Davis
Fletcher
Glenn
Lewis

Norris
Pittman
Sheppard
Shortridge
Stephens

Swanson
Thomas, Idaho
Townsend
Vandenberg
Wheeler

So Mr. BULOW's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the statement has been made that some Senators voted under a misapprehension the first time, and perhaps they will want to accord others a chance to correct such action, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand that the matter we are now about to vote upon is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] to the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. BORAH. Before we vote upon that, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri what will be the effect of the adoption of this amendment with reference to the limitation of time for the independence of the Philippines.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment will preclude any discussion. The substitute that we agreed upon can not get before the Senate unless an affirmative vote is registered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I may have misapprehended the statement made by the Senator from Missouri. I understood the Senator to state that if the amendment which is now pending and which we are to vote upon in a moment shall prevail, that will preclude any further consideration of the question of the step-up of the tariff, or any imposition of that character.

Mr. HAWES. Oh, no; quite the contrary. It will leave the matter open for very thorough discussion, so that we can vote on the matter on limitation, or plebiscite, or anything connected with it.

Mr. KING. Then the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana merely limits to six years the time within which the limitation of imports is fixed?

Mr. HAWES. That is right.

Mr. KING. But subsequently to that period, if the Congress desires, it may impose further limitations in the matter of tariff, or other limitations?

Mr. HAWES. In other words, it will leave the matter open for thorough debate and amendment on any portion of the bill; a separate vote on the plebiscite, if desired, a separate vote on time, and all of those elements.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the pending amendment stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I insist that the Senator from Missouri could not have understood the question of the Senator from Utah. It is perfectly apparent that if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], which was reconsidered a moment ago, is voted in a second time, it will have been fruitless to have reconsidered it, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] can not offer the compromise agreement reflected in his amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why I asked to have the pending amendment stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Would a motion to amend the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana by substituting there-

for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would hold in the affirmative.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then, Mr. President, why should we not proceed in that way, and vote the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico up or down as we see fit? Then, if it should be adopted, that would dispose of the matter. If it should be rejected, we would then consider the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The trouble with that proposition is that if the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is offered as a substitute for or amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana there would be no chance whatever to vote on any amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, because it would be an amendment in the third degree. There are some Members of the Senate who desire to vote separately on the question of a plebiscite. We shall not be able to do that if the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is offered as an amendment to that of the Senator from Louisiana. In order that we may have a chance to divide the question, and to offer amendments to the plan of the Senator from New Mexico, we should vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. FESS. Referring to the statement of the Senator from Washington, if the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is offered as a substitute for the pending amendment, would not that substitute be open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That substitute, in the form in which it has been presented to the Senate, will require a very considerable reconstruction of many portions of the bill; but in direct answer to the parliamentary question proposed by the Senator from Ohio, the present occupant of the chair would also hold in the affirmative on that question.

Mr. DILL. That it could be amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would so hold.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I should like to have the pending amendment stated to the Senate, so that we can understand exactly what we are doing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the committee will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask if it is not a fact that in the event the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana is adopted it will shut out any further amendment to the matters included in his amendment. Any other amendment to any provision included in his amendment would be shut out, as I understand, because it would then be an amendment in the third degree. So that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana that closes, so far as we are concerned, all the matters included in his amendment.

Is that the status?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would so hold.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated to the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Louisiana has offered the following amendment: In the official copy of the bill, or the bill reported by the committee, on page 37, the Senator from Louisiana proposes to strike out:

SEC. 9. (a) At any time after the expiration of the fifteenth year and before the expiration of the seventeenth year after the inauguration of the government provided for in this act the people of the Philippine Islands shall vote on the question of Philippine independence. The legislature of the Commonwealth of the Phil-

ippine Islands shall provide for the time and manner of an election for such purpose, at which the qualified voters of the Philippine Islands shall be entitled to vote.

(b) If a majority of the votes cast are in favor of Philippine independence, the chief executive of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall so report to the President of the United States, who shall, within 60 days after the receipt of such report, issue a proclamation announcing the results of such election, and within a period of two years after such report.

And to insert the following words:

Sec. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under a constitution provided for in this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when Mrs. CARAWAY's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. COPELAND (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. HEBERT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call with reference to my general pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I withhold my vote.

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call with regard to the pair of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], I am informed that if the senior Senator from New Mexico were present he would vote "nay," and if the senior Senator from Iowa were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that on this question the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY].

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily detained from the Senate in attendance upon the funeral of the late Representative Garrett.

I also wish to repeat the announcement that on this question the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], who is absent in attendance upon the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas, is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bankhead	Couzens	Long	Robinson, Ind.
Black	Dickinson	McGill	Schall
Broussard	Dill	Moses	Schuyler
Byrnes	Frazier	Neely	Shipstead
Capper	George	Norbeck	Smoot
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Trammell
Cohen	Howell	Oddie	White
Costigan	King	Reynolds	

NAYS—45

Ashurst	Bailey	Barkley	Blaine
Austin	Barbour	Bingham	Borah

Bulkley	Hale	La Follette	Tydings
Bulow	Harrison	Logan	Vandenberg
Coolidge	Hastings	McKellar	Wagner
Cutting	Hawes	McNary	Walcott
Dale	Hayden	Metcalf	Walsh, Mass.
Fess	Hebert	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	Hull	Reed	Watson
Goldsborough	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	
Gore	Kean	Smith	
Grammer	Kendrick	Steiwer	

NOT VOTING—20

Bratton	Davis	Norris	Swanson
Brookhart	Fletcher	Pittman	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Glenn	Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Keyes	Shortridge	Townsend
Copeland	Lewis	Stephens	Wheeler

So Mr. BROUSSARD's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

REIMBURSABLE CHARGES EXISTING AS DEBTS AGAINST INDIANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to adjustment or elimination of reimbursable charges of the Government existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, and transmitting for approval list of cancellations and adjustments, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers on the files of the department and its bureaus not needed or useful in the transaction of current business and having no permanent value or historical interest, and asking for action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. NYE and Mr. PITTMAN members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SENATE JOURNAL, LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Hawaii (communicated through the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior), transmitting copy of the journal of the senate of the legislature, Territory of Hawaii, special sessions of 1932, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from J. A. Greene, civil engineer, San Antonio, Tex., transmitting a paper entitled "How to Increase Our Circulating Medium by Taking Land Available as a Foundation," which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from J. Parker, secretary, etc., Philadelphia, Pa., in relation to a plan for the relief of unemployed persons, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented resolutions adopted by the Pulaski County Medical Society, of Little Rock, Ark., favoring the discontinuance of free hospital service to veterans for non-service-connected disabilities, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from Miss Emma M. Wilkinson, secretary Tight Barrel Circled Heading Manufacturers Association, Memphis, Tenn., operating mills, among others, at Searcy, Paragould, Hope, Pine Bluff, and Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas, praying for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and the passage of legislation legalizing the

manufacture and sale of beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a letter from A. O. Stewart, president Phoenix Joint Stock Land Bank of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo., in relation to farm mortgages and land bank legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a letter from Frederick H. Allen, New York City, N. Y., in relation to farm mortgages and land bank legislation, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Havre de Grace, Md., favoring the making of an appropriation of \$12,000 for the purpose of dredging a channel 60 feet wide and 6 feet deep at mean low tide from Point Concord, on the Susquehanna River, westward along and about 100 feet from the shore to a point opposite the southerly limits of the city of Havre de Grace to connect with the channel known as Oakington Channel, already existing, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of the public utilities committee, Bethesda Chamber of Commerce, of Bethesda, Md., praying for the prompt passage of legislation authorizing a merger of transportation utilities in the District of Columbia, and also that "taxicabs and hired vehicles be placed under some intelligent supervision, looking forward to a further protection of the people's rights and interests," which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, N. Y., protesting against the Executive order abolishing the United States Employees' Compensation Commission as an independent office and transferring its duties and activities to the Department of Labor, especially in connection with the administration of the longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation act, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRAMMER presented the petition of the Bethany Methodist Episcopal Brotherhood, of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of legislation providing regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Bethany Methodist Episcopal Brotherhood, of Tacoma, and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Clarkston, in the State of Washington, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Altoona; the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Baxter Springs; the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Rosedale Methodist Episcopal Church, of Kansas City; the Young Woman's Christian Association of Lake City; and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Ottawa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Herington and the Wichita Council of Churches, in the State of Kansas, protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification of the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of adult members of the congregation of the Methodist Church and Sunday school of Wellsville, and sundry citizens of Isabel, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Women's Bible Class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Parsons; the Young Woman's Christian Associations of Lake

City and Parsons; the Woman's Home Missionary Societies of the Washington Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church and of the Rosedale Methodist Episcopal Church, both of Kansas City; the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Council Grove; and the Woman's Home Missionary Societies of Altoona, Attica, Baldwin, Baxter Springs, Blue Rapids, Caldwell, Concordia, Enterprise, Junction City, Mayetta, Ottawa, Parsons, Rice, St. Francis, Sedan, and Stockton, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of legislation providing regulation of the motion-picture industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4810) to authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to withhold the pay of officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to cover indebtedness to the United States under certain conditions, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1005) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5148) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust debts owing the United States for seed, feed, and crop-production loans, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1006) thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF RENTAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 302, submitted by Mr. CAPPER on the 13th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 248, agreed to June 27, 1932, authorizing and directing the Committee on the District of Columbia, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate rental conditions in said District of Columbia and to report the results of same, with recommendations, to the Senate not later than December 15, 1932, hereby is continued and extended in full force and effect until January 10, 1933.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Montana (for Mr. WHEELER):

A bill (S. 5200) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Letitia Stookey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 5203) for the relief of the Harvey Canal Ship Yard & Machine Shop (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5204) for the relief of the Texas Power & Light Co. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5205) for the relief of the Great Falls Meat Co., of Great Falls, Mont. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5206) for the relief of Lawrence S. Copeland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5207) for the relief of Rose Gillespie, Joseph Anton Dietz, and Manuel M. Wiseman, as trustee of the estate of Louis Wiseman, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5208) for the relief of Mary Byrnett Sinks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED and Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 5209) to procure a site for a Federal building at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5210) granting a pension to Ben Harrison Martin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 5211) for the relief of James Clay Colson; to the Committee on Claims.

FEES FOR RADIO LICENSES

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for fees for radio licenses and other purposes and ask to have it referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 5201) to provide for fees for radio licenses and other purposes was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DILL. I wish to say that when I reported the bill (H. R. 7716) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce a few days ago, this section of the bill was taken out for the reason that we had not had hearings on that provision. I think it is highly desirable that radio stations in this country should provide a large part of the cost of regulation by the Government. I hope to have hearings on the bill and have it reported in the very near future.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13520) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MANGANESE ORE

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance a letter written by George H. Crosby, Duluth, Minn., to the Secretary of the Treasury, setting out facts concerning the domestic protection of manganese ore, which seems to me to be vital to our economic independence and may, perhaps, be vital even to the maintenance of our boasted liberty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter is as follows:

OCTOBER 24, 1932.

HON. OGDEN MILLS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has just been called to my attention that your department is suspending appraisal of duties on steel products imported into the United States in violation of the anti-dumping act of 1921, since the Treasury Department has refused to take similar action suspending appraisal of manganese imports from Russia, Brazil, India, and Africa.

The manganese industry of the United States has been in a very critical condition since the signing of the armistice in 1918 and will continue to be in that condition so long as manganese ores are imported from Russia, Brazil, India, and Africa.

At the time that the United States entered the World War the domestic owners of manganese ore and manganiferous ore were requested by the Government to open up their mines and produce manganese ore for war purposes. The owners of these manganese mines responded in a whole-hearted way and invested millions of dollars in the opening of these mines on the promise of the United States Government that they would be made whole in their investment and that an embargo would be placed on foreign ores and would be kept in force until two years after the close of the war.

The embargo was lifted before the signing of the armistice in 1918. The above action caused a tremendous loss to all domestic producers. That action cost me personally more than \$500,000.

Since 1918 the domestic producers have not been fairly treated by the manufacturers of steel; they have purchased the low-cost ores from foreign countries and the domestic ores have remained in the ground, throwing out of work 10,000 workers. There is no valid excuse for the manufacturers of steel for not using domestic ores. The cost per manufactured ton of steel compared with the cost of domestic ores against foreign ores amounts to but 16 cents per manufactured ton. The operation of domestic mines in case of war is absolutely essential.

If American producers were assured of a market, vast quantities of manganese ore could and would be developed in America and would assure this country of a supply in case of future wars and would also give a peace-time supply of manganese ore mined by American workers in American mines.

The United States Government has only one solution to its manganese problem, and that is to give proper encouragement to the development of manganese mines in the United States.

Col. Frederick H. Paine, Assistant Secretary of War, went before the Senate Finance Committee in 1932 and told that committee that it was absolutely essential that this mineral should be mined from mines within the border of the United States as a war measure.

I can not understand why the domestic producers of manganese ore are not given the same kind of consideration that is given to

other raw materials, such as copper, coal, oil, and lumber, and to manufactured steel products. Unless the producers of domestic ores are given immediate relief against the dumping of foreign ores, every American producer will be in the hands of a receiver.

The official map of the United States Bureau of Mines shows 314 deposits of manganese in 34 States, as follows:

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The above statements are based upon facts and if there arises any question in the minds of the Treasury Department to this point, additional evidence will be furnished to corroborate the statements above made.

Respectfully submitted.

GEO. H. CROSBY.

ADDRESS BY FREDERIC R. COUDERT ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL DEBTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an address recently delivered over the radio by one of the most distinguished lawyers of my State, Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, giving his views on the problem presented by the existence of the intergovernmental debts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the early part of the Great War a statement appeared in the newspapers emanating from one of the world's most distinguished scientists, long a resident of the United States and connected with one of its most important scientific institutions. When asked how long he thought the war would endure, this distinguished man replied that in his opinion it would last for 50 years. This seemingly extraordinary statement doubtless shocked some but was received with smiling incredulity by others.

Alas, to-day the statement seems far more significant than it did 14 years ago. True it is that the cannon has ceased to roar, the airplane to drop its deadly missile on great cities, and the favoring winds to carry the lethal gases since November 11, 1918. Yet man carries on war not only with deadly physical weapons but with other methods that may be just as detrimental to the developments of peace and of prosperity. We are suffering from a depression which is causing the world a distress as widespread, as deep, and as discouraging as might actual physical warfare. Even in the United States of America, least directly affected by the Great War, and apparently left in a high state of prosperity at its conclusion, some 12,000,000 men face unemployment and millions of people are literally without means of sustenance.

The situation has endured for the past three years and is rapidly degenerating from a condition of mere emergency to one of chronic pauperism and national misery. Some there are who do not believe in the potency of human effort and who look upon the rise and fall of nations and the recurring disasters of mankind as inevitable incidents of history which must be accepted with stoic fortitude but which can not be materially altered by man's intelligence and will. This philosophy was more popular in the ancient world than in the modern and is more prevalent in the East than in the West. It was never entertained by the American people. From the early days when a few settlers dominated the wilderness and repelled the hordes of savages who might have exterminated their feeble number, until the present time, the attitude of America has been one of hopeful, helpful, courageous activity.

And yet to-day we seem to be powerless in the face of forces that are destroying our trade, dismantling our factories, and minimizing our commerce. Emotion seems to be usurping the field that should be left to reason, and ultranationalism is blaming the foreigner and seeking to persuade the people of America that they can live in a disdainful isolation, indifferent to the opinion of the world, conscious of their own rectitude and confident in their ability alone to restore conditions of national prosperity. This popular attitude may, indeed, be explicable in part by the widespread suffering of a recently prosperous people, who are impatient, quite naturally, with impartial, objective, attempts to fathom the causes of our problems.

It must, however, be admitted that this dreadful situation, confined not to America alone but world-wide in its scope, is in the main the resultant of the Great War and the legacies left by that hideous calamity. With one of these legacies the people of the United States are confronted to-day. Upon this question of paramount importance our Congress must either act or refuse to act. Refusal to act means a further drifting policy and one, indeed, dangerous to the Nation in its efforts at recovery.

The question of the so-called intergovernmental debts has long been with us. The subject has involved discussion that would fill many volumes. The statistical analyses are to the ordinary man confusing and complicated, requiring a knowledge of accountancy and technique of finance with which he is not equipped. It is sufficient for him to answer that the debts are legal obligations, that they must be met, and that the attempt to shift the burden from the shoulders of the debtor nations to the taxpayer of America is an attempt to avoid the payment of a just debt. Were the matter as simple as that it would not even afford ground for discussion. It is very much the position assumed by

the creditor nations as to Germany, throughout the long struggle for German reparations.

From the time of the signing of the Versailles treaty down to the recent Lausanne conference of last summer Europe has been distracted over the question of German reparations. These reparation payments, placing an immense burden of taxation on two generations of Germans were in one form or another resented and resisted almost from the beginning. After several years of debate France finally occupied the Ruhr, that richest manufacturing and coal-producing district in Germany, with the hope that either by direct means or through the fear thereby inspired reparation payments might be exacted. This eventuated in failure, and finally the Dawes plan was evolved facilitating the payments and equating the annual payments in a measure proportionate to what was then deemed Germany's capacity to pay.

After a few years of payment under this plan came the Young plan, by which Germany agreed to pay a sum very much less than that originally envisaged by the Versailles treaty. Finally, with the coming of the depression, this, too, broke down, and Germany showed not only an inability but an unwillingness to make further payment. The European atmosphere was charged with gloom. If Germany were driven into hopeless bankruptcy, there was the probability of bolshevism, alliance with Russia, and further general conflict threatening the very life of European civilization. At that moment President Hoover, with fine appreciation of the situation, asked Congress to ratify his plan for a year's delay in all payments of debts arising out of the war, not merely the reparations due from Germany to the allied nations but the amounts due from the allied nations to the United States of America.

The present situation can not be understood apart from the origin of these obligations.

Denuded of the maze of figures with which a detailed description of the origin and history of the war debts must be accompanied, it suffices to say that the Treasury, acting under the authority of the Liberty loan act of Congress of 1917-18, loaned to the allied governments the sum of approximately \$10,000,000,000. Of this sum the total volume of credit established in favor of foreign governments up to the time of the armistice was approximately \$8,000,000,000. The remainder was credited after the armistice and down to December 1, 1918. Of this latter sum a substantial part was used for the liquidation of war accounts, interest on war-time loans, and the remainder for reconstruction and relief purposes. Mark one vital fact in connection with these loans. The governing principle prescribed by the United States was that the credit should only be given for the purpose of meeting payments due in the United States.

This principle, announced at the very beginning by our Treasury, was adhered to throughout. Thus let it be noted that these fixed sums of money were expended in the United States for the purchase of war supplies from our factories at the enormous prices then prevailing, with the consequent profits and benefits to American industry and business, and in addition the large amounts paid on income and profit taxes into the Treasury of the United States. It may be said in passing that the borrowing governments could to-day replace the goods so purchased in the United States at about one-third the price paid therefor, were we willing to let them do so. Of course, this is impossible to do because of the tariff barriers erected against the importation of foreign supplies.

These facts do not, of course, affect the legal obligation of the debts; but they may well lead the American people to consider with serious and sympathetic attention the plea of the debtors who ask, not for a cancellation of the obligation but a revision thereof in conformity with existing economic conditions—and a continuance of the Hoover moratorium during the discussion. The nature and purpose of the American loan was not any mere generous impulse to aid the foreigner but, at that time, was deemed to be the most effective method of carrying on the war against the powerful enemy whom we were fighting. This was officially stated by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Mr. Carter Glass, in his annual report for the year 1919, in which he uses the following significant language:

"In the beginning before the creation of our great army, the principal assistance of America was necessarily through foreign loans, and it was then that these advances proved so potent in contributing to the final victory. . . ."

"The service of these loans in assisting to hold the battle fronts of Europe until the might of our heroic Army could be felt effectively, made possible, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the ending of the war in the fall of 1918. Without this aid to the allied governments the war unquestionably would have been prolonged if not lost, with the resultant additional cost in life and treasure."

In a debate over the statute authorizing these loans, Senator Cummins, of Iowa, made the following prophetic statement:

"I should like to give to the allied nations three billions of dollars, if they need the contribution, with never a thought of its repayment at any time or under any circumstances. I should like to give that or whatever sum may be thought needed as our donation to one phase of our own war. But I feel that, in the years to come, the fact that the United States had in its possession bonds of these great countries, which when they emerge from the war will all be bankrupt, will create an embarrassment from which the men of those times will find it difficult to escape. I think it will cost us more to take those bonds and to hold them against these governments than it would cost us to give the money with a generous and patriotic spirit—to do something which for the time being, for the moment, we are unable to do with our own Army and our own Navy." (April 17, 1917.)

A side light upon the moral atmosphere prevailing in the Congress of that day appeared in a debate on the first Liberty loan act where sentiment was expressed in favor of making a large money gift to France in recognition of the assistance rendered the United States during the Revolutionary War. What the fate of this plan might have been in Congress I am unable to say had not the American ambassador in Paris cabled the Secretary of State that the French Premier personally expressed the hope to him that no resolution would be introduced in the Congress tending to make a gift to the Government of France, however much the sentiments of good will prompting it might be appreciated by the French people.

As a consequence of the Hoover moratorium the French Premier, Mr. Laval, visited this country. After various conferences with the President of the United States regarding debt matters he returned to France. The primary purpose of his visit was to reach an understanding with the American Government as to the policy to be pursued with respect to the intergovernmental obligations covered by the moratorium.

At that time France was insistent upon continuing the arrangements comprising the Young plan and forcing Germany to make the payments due thereunder. While no definite arrangement was reached, it was believed that Mr. Laval had been urged to impress upon his government the importance of reaching a final settlement of the reparation agreement with Germany before asking the United States for any revision of the debt payments.

A joint statement issued by President Hoover and Mr. Laval on October 25, 1931, reads as follows:

"In so far as intergovernmental obligations are concerned, we recognize that prior to the expiration of the Hoover year of postponement some agreement regarding them may be necessary, covering the period of business depression, as to the terms and conditions of which the two Governments make all reservations. The initiative in this matter should be taken at an early date by the European powers principally concerned within the framework of the agreement existing prior to July 1, 1931."

Impressed with the necessity for bringing about a final settlement of the German reparations and the imminent danger of complete disruption of international trade that must result from any further drifting, a conference was held at Lausanne last July, and a settlement reached between Germany and her creditors. This settlement provided that the reparations which Germany was required to pay the Allies be reduced from the original total of thirty-two billion, stated by the reparation commission in 1921, to approximately seven hundred fourteen million. The reduction from this fantastic total to a comparatively insignificant sum of seven hundred fourteen million marked the final failure of the policy pursued by the Allies in the attempt to collect reparations from Germany. It illustrated the impossibility of any nation to make great international payments, save through goods or services.

There is no other way in which such payments can be made save in gold, and the total gold supply of the world is not sufficient to pay intergovernmental debts, nor would it profit nations to be paid in gold and to bankrupt the customers on whom they depended for markets. Germany's creditors agreed to this drastic action not from motives of altruism but for reasons of enlightened self-interest. They feared further pressure upon Germany would destroy the whole fabric of international trade in Europe and would prove most harmful to them.

Throughout this long, bitter controversy between Germany and her creditors, France and Great Britain, economists and financial experts, as well as generally informed opinion throughout the United States, had been demanding some settlement. The impossibility of collecting such sums of money from two generations of Germans was recognized to be not only impossible but to create a situation in which the restoration of international trade was hopeless.

To-day the same situation confronts the United States, and the question is whether we will deal with our own debtors as we so desired Germany's creditors to deal with her. The same conditions of world-wide business prostration must inevitably lead us to the same conclusion as France and Great Britain reached regarding Germany. It is futile longer to state that the money was hired and the debt was owed; that wicked and dishonest debtors are attempting to place upon the American taxpayer a burden rightfully belonging to them. These are now cries of ignorance, of emotion, or of a demagogic intent upon obscuring the issue by inflaming that kind of patriotism which the famous Doctor Johnson so caustically characterized as the final resort of the scoundrel.

Once before a somewhat similar situation confronted a great people. In the 15 years of the death struggle with the genius of Napoleon, England loaned immense sums to her allies on the Continent. These sums she remitted, although herself in dire distress, because her statesmen of that time considered that "no arrangement could be wise that carried ruin to one of the countries between which it was concluded."

The sole question to-day is, What is the interest of the American people? Shall they refuse any prolongation of the Hoover moratorium, although conditions which called for that moratorium exist in even greater degree to-day? Shall they acquiesce in a possible refusal by the present Congress of the United States to grant any revision of these war debts? Are they willing to treat our former associates in war, Great Britain and France, as dishonest debtors seeking to evade a just liability, and to drive them into a default, which must, if not immediately, at least in the near future become inevitable?

These debts can be paid only in goods or in gold. The high tariff barriers, made even higher so recently, make the payments in goods impossible. To make the payment in gold, as so clearly shown by the British note of December 1, would dislocate the exchanges of the world, lead our debtors to curtail to the absolute minimum imports from the United States, and thus further lower commodity prices upon which any return of American prosperity must depend. Not only that, but as the Lausanne settlement was predicated upon a revision by the United States of the amounts owing to us, the German reparation question will thus be alive again and all progress made toward a riddance of these war legacies will be lost.

Let us rid ourselves of cant in this matter. The intergovernmental debts as they stand can not and will not be paid. They run for the next 50 years and the hopelessness of continuance of payments of these debts in gold and without tariff arrangements, which would allow them to be paid in goods, is completely evident.

American public opinion is, therefore, confronted with the alternative of driving their debtors into insolvency and repudiation (if not in the near future at least within another year, as the next payment is due in July, 1933) or with adopting a policy of revision of the whole debt question with the resultant profit to the United States in a revival of trade and the cessation of world agitation constantly disturbing all international exchange.

It has been stated that only 10 per cent of our trade is foreign trade, and that the United States could live without foreign trade, prosperous and happy within its own borders. Whether such a situation is possible is a matter of theoretic speculation. The statement is, however, utterly misleading. One-half of our cotton, one-third of our wheat, a great proportion of our tobacco and copper find their way into foreign markets. Our farmers and the producing classes generally would be ruined by the destruction of our foreign trade, and we should have to reorganize our American life upon lower and more elementary bases. Is it conceivable that we could return to the world of 100 years ago, with its small population, its rural life, and its absence of all those conveniences which the progress of modern science has brought us and which have now become necessities?

This question of the debts can not and will not down. It is possible, despite the reasons given for a prolongation of the Hoover moratorium, that Congress will insist upon payment December 15 and that payment may be made. If so, the question will remain as vital as ever. Economists and students of the situation warn that between now and July, 1933, there may well be no recovery of prosperity, and that at that time, unless some revision can take place, conditions may be worse both in Europe and in the United States than they now are. Our foreign trade, which has already shrunk more than one-half, must continue to diminish.

These views have the sanction not only of noted economists in America and throughout the world generally, but of the most expert and practical world opinion, as shown by the report published only a few days ago (November 27) by a special committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. That body, so representative of American industry and having at its command the best brains and expert knowledge, has made the following statement:

"Study of the international aspects of the war debts has brought forcibly to the attention of the committee fundamental defects inherent in the very existence of debts owing by one government to another. Funds for their repayment must first be obtained by taxing the citizens of the debtor countries, and must be appropriated for that purpose through legislative action. Governments being the parties to the debts, they are handled through diplomatic rather than business channels.

"Arising as they have from war and the destruction caused by war, the intergovernmental debts owed to the United States have been a continual source of political agitation, both here and abroad, and have colored the relations between the United States and the debtor governments. The parliamentary and political discussion of the debts has made for hostility and antagonism and has inhibited the growth of normal trade and business relations between the countries affected.

"The committee is convinced that it would be distinctly in the interest of better international relations if the debts can be so dealt with as to remove their discussion from the political field.

"If changes in economic and social conditions have profoundly altered the original bases for such agreements, and it is the belief of this committee that they have, further examination of the situation and adjustment of the terms of the agreements are justifiable and to be recommended."

The views of the cotton trade, a trade so essential to the prosperity of our Southern States, appeared in the Weekly Cotton Review November 28, as follows:

"The dominant influence in the cotton market last week was the war-debt negotiations. With declines in other commodities, securities, and sterling, cotton moved to lower levels on liquidation of Government holdings and only moderate investment demands."

On November 14, 1932, a committee composed of 1,000 men in all forms of business and social activity throughout the United States, published a report signed by some of America's leading economists. This report reviews the situation thoroughly and concludes with this statement:

"A realization of the consequences to American well-being of excessive demands upon our debtors makes a reconsideration of existing debt agreements necessary. By a sensible readjustment of these agreements, which would stimulate a revival of business,

the American people would stand to gain far more in dollars and cents through a revival of trade with Europe than they would gain in an attempt to collect the last dollar."

A further consideration should dictate to Congress the necessity for according to our debtor nations further time during which the matter of revision may be discussed. Unless this time is granted and the necessity for revision admitted there can be no real moral disarmament and world peace. Germany will again be threatened with the payment of coerced reparations, great bitterness will be aroused among the debtor nations, and the attempts at disarmament, in which America has taken the lead, will be further postponed and frustrated. An atmosphere more tense, more hostile, more filled with suffering and bitterness than we have seen since the war is rapidly being engendered.

It will not do for the American people—a great and generous and on the whole sane and wise people—to insist upon the letter of the law and the payment of the precise sum denominated in the bond. Their own selfish interest requires that they should reach an agreement with their debtors which may take this fearful question out of politics and settle it once and for all—perhaps through the payment of some definite and fixed sum, as was arranged with Germany at Lausanne. But even beyond the immediate selfish interest and the restoration of trade, even beyond the interest of the farmer in the selling of his wheat abroad and of the cotton grower in the exporting of his product, stands the infinite danger to all international relations—a deadlock between the great nations of the world over this dreadful legacy of intergovernmental debts and reparations.

Must this be indefinitely allowed to threaten peace and prosperity everywhere and to prevent the restoration of real peace among the nations—a peace predicated upon the understanding that the prosperity of one is dependent upon that of all, and that no nation or nations can afford to drive others to desperation, to bankruptcy, and to debt repudiation?

The policy of conciliation and of cooperation throughout the world is not only dictated by a desire for peace and a continuance of our civilization, but it is essential if industry is to be restored, agriculture rehabilitated, and the mass of the unemployed restored to productive work.

The technical and statistical forms in which the debt situation has been involved have obscured the fundamental factors in the mind of the average man. We must wage a campaign of education in this regard to show where the real interests of the United States lie and to point out that we are now facing the greatest crisis that has come to us since 1914. If we can not overcome it by reason, by intelligent statesmanship, and by conciliatory effort, our own prosperity will be more menaced than ever and we shall remain isolated, misunderstood, and perhaps hated in a world bordering on bankruptcy and anarchy.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], who is about to take the floor, whether the amendment which he is about to submit, in the form of a substitute or otherwise, contains any provision in regard to this matter:

So long as any duties may be levied and collected by the United States under this act upon any articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands, the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands may levy and collect duties upon any articles coming into the Philippines from the United States.

Mr. CUTTING. No; there is no such provision in it.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator, who is one of the co-authors of the pending bill, whether it is the intention of those who drafted the bill, or the committee reporting it, to offer an amendment to the bill which will permit the Philippine Commonwealth, when so organized, and so long as the United States imposes tariff duties, to impose duties upon commodities going from the United States into the Philippine Islands?

Mr. CUTTING. I wish the Senator would propound that question to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], because I understand that he has already submitted an amendment to that effect.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit, I will offer as an amendment the language I have just read, to be inserted on page 31 of the committee amendment, following line 5. I ask that it may lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. KING. I have just read it to the Senate, so I will just offer it, and ask that it be considered as pending and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be entered. Mr. CUTTING obtained the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I wanted to inquire whether or not the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] expected to make a motion to strike out, beginning with line 3, page 4, to the end of the amendment, with reference to the plebiscite?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I intend to offer the amendment whenever the Senator from New Mexico shall offer his amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. I wanted to be sure that the amendment would be offered.

Mr. BYRNES. So much of the amendment as includes section 9 (a).

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, that means that the Senator from South Carolina is going to offer to strike out that part of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico which deals with the plebiscite?

Mr. CUTTING. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. That is all right.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from New Mexico offers the following amendment in the bill as reported from the committee: On page 29, line 22, to strike out the word "eleventh" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "eighth"; on page 30, line 3, to strike out the word "twelfth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "ninth"; on page 30, line 5, to strike out the word "thirteenth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "tenth"; on page 30, line 13, to strike out the word "fourteenth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "eleventh"; on page 30, line 18, to strike out the word "fourteenth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "eleventh," so that subdivision (e) of section 6 shall read as follows:

(e) The government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall impose and collect an export tax on all articles that may be exported to the United States from the Philippine Islands free of duty under the provisions of existing law as modified by the foregoing provisions of this section, including the articles enumerated in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c), within the limitations therein specified, as follows:

(1) During the eighth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 5 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

(2) During the ninth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 10 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

(3) During the tenth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 15 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

(4) During the eleventh year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 20 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

(5) After the expiration of the eleventh year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 25 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries.

The government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall place all funds received from such export taxes in a sinking fund, and such fund shall, in addition to other moneys available for that purpose, be applied solely to the payment of the principal and interest on the bonded indebtedness of the Philippine Islands, its Provinces, municipalities, and instrumentalities, until such indebtedness has been fully discharged.

When used in this section in a geographical sense, the term "United States" includes all Territories and possessions of the

United States except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the island of Guam.

On page 37, line 9, to strike out the word "fifteenth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "twelfth"; on page 37, line 9, to strike out the word "seventeenth" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "thirteenth," so that subdivision (a) of section 9 shall read as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) At any time after the expiration of the twelfth year and before the expiration of the thirteenth year after the inauguration of the government provided for in this act the people of the Philippine Islands shall vote on the question of Philippine independence. The Legislature of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall provide for the time and manner of an election for such purpose at which the qualified voters of the Philippine Islands shall be entitled to vote.

On page 37, line 23, to strike out the words "two years" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "one year," so as to read:

(b) If a majority of the votes cast are in favor of Philippine independence, the chief executive of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall so report to the President of the United States, who shall, within 60 days after the receipt of such report, issue a proclamation announcing the results of such election, and within a period of one year after such report the President of the United States shall withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands, and, on behalf of the United States, shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, under the constitution then in force.

On page 40, line 8, to strike out the word "ten" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "seven," so as to read:

(c) If a majority of the votes cast are against Philippine independence, the chief executive of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall so report to the Congress of the United States for their action regarding the future political status of the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That until Congress otherwise provides, the Philippine Islands shall revert to the status established by this act for the first seven years after the inauguration of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands.

On page 21, line 3, after the word "fix," to insert the words "within one year after the enactment of this act," so as to read:

CONVENTION TO FRAME CONSTITUTION FOR PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

SECTION 1. The Philippine Legislature is hereby authorized to provide for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, which shall meet in the hall of the house of representatives in the capital of the Philippine Islands, at such time as the Philippine Legislature may fix, within one year after the enactment of this act, to formulate and draft a constitution for the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, subject to the conditions and qualifications prescribed in this act, which shall exercise jurisdiction over all the territory ceded to the United States by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 10th day of December, 1898—

And so forth.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask the Senator to yield in order that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, as to whether or not this amendment containing these substitute proposals may not be divided, so that we can have a separate vote upon the amendment on page 4, including section 9 (a)?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The decision of the Chair is that any amendment can be divided, especially amendments to strike out and insert.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to give notice at this time that I shall ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 4, involving section 9 (a), relating to the plebiscite.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, does not the Senator intend also to include the entire page 4? The first five lines are a part of that which begins with section 9 (a).

Mr. BYRNES. All that is contained on page 4 of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico refers to the plebiscite, and it is as to that amendment that I intend to ask for a separate vote.

Mr. CUTTING. I would like to point out to the Senator from South Carolina that if all that is stricken out, the plebiscite will still remain in the bill.

Mr. BYRNES. The only way it can be reached now, in my opinion, is by first moving to amend and then, when we reach the bill, it will follow that a motion would be in order to strike out the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CUTTING. I have no objection to any procedure the Senator from South Carolina sees fit to follow.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Perhaps it is not necessary for me to put the inquiry, in view of the statement just made, but am I to understand that by way of motion or suggested amendment to the proposed amendment we may have a separate vote on the question of the plebiscite? Is that the understanding and the agreement here among Senators? Some of us are unalterably opposed to the plebiscite. We might yield to compromise as to other features in the bill, but is it understood that at some time we may have a separate vote, and a discussion if necessary, upon the plebiscite?

Mr. CUTTING. That is absolutely agreeable to the proponents of the bill.

Mr. President, I explained this amendment the other day, and I do not intend to repeat at any length. It cuts down by five years the period provided for in the bill. It provides for 7 years of import limitation instead of 10 years. It then provides, as in the bill, for five years of export tax graduated each year. After that it provides that the plebiscite shall be held within one year instead of within two years, as in the bill. Furthermore, it provides that the United States shall be given one year after the plebiscite, rather than two years, in which to withdraw. The net saving is five years from the period at which the interim government goes into effect.

In addition the amendment provides that after the enactment of the bill by Congress the Philippine Legislature must fix a time to grant a constitution and must fix that time within one year. There is no such provision in the present bill. That, of course, may save a great deal of additional time beyond the five years which I have mentioned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator read the exact language which will accomplish the purpose he desires?

Mr. CUTTING. The language is "within one year after the enactment of this act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire the amendment reported?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the statement of the Senator from New Mexico is sufficient. Does "amendment of this act" mean the action of the Congress upon it rather than the action of the Philippine Legislature making it effective?

Mr. CUTTING. I should think it was absolutely clear. All the Philippine Legislature does is to accept the act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The act is not effective until the Philippine Legislature does act.

Mr. CUTTING. No; but the words in the amendment indicate its purpose clearly, I believe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it the intent of the author of the amendment that the provision shall relate to the time when the Congress concludes its action?

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; absolutely. We think that makes the situation clear.

We had originally fixed the longer period because that was the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, but it is quite evident that there is a strong feeling in the Senate that the time should be cut down. Under this amendment it would be cut down as far as the members of the committee feel it possibly could be cut while preserving justice for the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The 12 years would be cut down to 8 years by the Senate amendment, but we would still be able to go into conference and determine as between 8 years and 12 years?

Mr. CUTTING. Oh, of course.

Mr. LONG. It may still be made 10 years.

Mr. CUTTING. Everything we do here is subject to conference.

The debatable matter which will be brought up by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is the question of the plebiscite. I have already spoken on that, and I think most Senators have made up their minds on that subject. Our idea was that we ought not to force the Philippines from under the flag if they desire to remain. We felt that they were in a better position to judge that desire after they had experienced the detrimental action of the tariffs than they are at the present time.

My personal view—and I have been supported in that view by practically all the representatives of the Philippines who are here present—is that under any circumstances the Philippine people desire independence and would so vote. I think, however, that they have a right to make that decision for themselves at the proper time and at a time when they have learned the issues at stake. If the 25 per cent tariff, which is the maximum which they will experience under the interim government, is too high to enable them to lead their economic life, then it is obvious that they would not be able to stand the 100 per cent tariff which would go into effect immediately after they obtain their freedom.

These are the considerations which actuated the committee in bringing out the proposal for a plebiscite. That, of course, is subject to any action which the Senate may take, and I do not think that any words of mine can make the issue any clearer. I should like, however, to read briefly from one or two statements by former Presidents of the United States.

In 1908 President Roosevelt in his message to Congress said:

I trust that within a generation the time will arrive when the Filipinos can decide for themselves whether it is well for them to become independent.

The decision was to be referred to the Philippine people, according to the intent of that statement.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CUTTING. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That was an utterance by President Roosevelt in 1908?

Mr. CUTTING. Yes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. A generation has come and gone. We are now in 1932 and those Filipino people then referred to now want their independence. Why continue it 15 or 18 or 20 years longer?

Mr. CUTTING. My point is that the people of the Philippines as a people have not rendered any decision as to that matter. The only statements we have come from representatives of theirs and from the legislature; and while we accept those people as representing the Philippine Islands, it has seemed to the committee that the clearest and most definite and final solution of the question is to allow the people themselves to vote on it after experiencing just what they will have should they obtain their independence.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CUTTING. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If then this provision for a plebiscite, in other words, a vote as to independence of these people, is that to be decided some 14, 16, 18, 20, or more years hence, then as to our commercial relations, as to our

economic relations with the islands, are not all those relations left in uncertainty? Is not the very question of independence suspended? How can business, how can commercial interests, go forward whilst that question of independence is left suspended and undetermined?

Mr. CUTTING. I think that under the provisions of the bill the conditions are laid down very clearly for the time from the present up to the date of the plebiscite. Of course, the action of the people at the plebiscite is something which we can not prophesy at the present time with any accuracy, though we can guess what will happen.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If the Senator will indulge me another question—

Mr. CUTTING. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If within 15 or 20 years from now there should be held the election, and the people in the so-called plebiscite should vote against accepting independence, where would we be? What would be the situation? Would not we be left in a state of uncertainty?

Mr. CUTTING. Not according to the terms of the bill, because it provides that in that event we revert to the status of the 10-year-limit period or the 7-year-limitation period, as it would be under my amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from New Mexico read a moment ago from a statement made by Theodore Roosevelt to the effect that within a generation the Philippines would desire their independence. I ask the Senator if the provision in the bill by which they are to formulate and vote upon a constitution within the next two years would not be a sufficient compliance with the spirit and, indeed, the letter of the statement of Mr. Roosevelt? In other words, when they vote to adopt a constitution formulated by themselves or their representatives for what we denominate a commonwealth, does not that indicate their desire to have independence, and would not that meet the requirements of the statement made by Mr. Roosevelt?

Mr. CUTTING. My answer to the Senator would be that it does come within the letter of the statement of President Roosevelt. I do not believe it comes within the spirit of the statement. I say that for the reason that since the message of President Roosevelt we have enforced on the Philippine Islands against their own wishes a peculiar economic relation to ourselves, and that until the people realize the difficulties which are going to be involved in breaking away from that arrangement they are not in a position to decide for themselves as they would be at the end of this trial period.

However, I was merely reading the statements from Presidents to show that in each case the question is to be left to the Filipinos to decide for themselves. I hope I may be permitted to read the other statements at this time, and then I shall be glad to yield to any further question.

Again, President Roosevelt in a message to Congress in 1906 said:

I hope and believe that these steps—

That is, setting up the Philippine legislative assembly—mark the beginnings of a course which will continue until the Filipinos become fit to decide for themselves whether they desire to be an independent nation.

President Taft, when Secretary of War, in March, 1905, said:

What shall be done in the future * * * is a question which will doubtless have to be settled by another generation than the present, both of the American and of the Philippine people, to whose wisdom and generosity we may safely trust the solution of the problem. Should the Philippine people when fit for self-government demand independence, I should be strongly in favor of giving it to them, and I have no doubt that the American people of the next generation would be of the same opinion.

In his special report in 1908, while Secretary of War, he said:

It (the United States policy toward the Philippines) necessarily involves in its ultimate conclusion as the steps toward self-government become greater and greater, the ultimate independence of the islands, although, of course, if both the United States and the islands were to conclude after complete self-government were possible that it would be mutually beneficial to continue a governmental relation between them like that between England and Australia, there would be nothing inconsistent with the present policy in such result. * * * If the American Government can only remain in the islands long enough to educate the entire people, to give them a language which enables them to come into contact with modern civilization, and to extend to them from time to time additional political rights so that by the exercise of them they shall learn the use and responsibilities necessary to their proper exercise, independence can be granted with entire safety to the people. I have an abiding conviction that the Philippine people are capable of being taught self-government in the process of their self-development * * *. While I have always refrained from making this (the development of trade between the occident and the orient) the chief reason of the retention of the Philippines, because the real reason lies in the obligation of the United States to make its people fit for self-government, and then to turn the government over to them, I don't think it improper in order to secure support for the policy to state such additional reason.

In March, 1918, Mr. Taft said in an address:

It (the statement in the Democratic platform favoring independence) is an affirmation of policy only slightly different from that repeatedly announced by this and preceding Republican administrations.

While Secretary of War in an address at the inauguration of the Philippine Assembly in 1907, Mr. Taft said:

How long this process of political preparation of the Philippine people is likely to be is a question which no one can certainly answer. When I was in the islands the last time, I ventured the opinion that it would take considerably longer than a generation. I have not changed my view upon this point, but the issue is one upon which opinions differ * * *. As I premised, however, this is a question for settlement by the Congress of the United States.

I shall read a quotation from President Coolidge in 1924 in a letter written to the speaker of the Philippine Legislature. President Coolidge said:

If the time comes when it is apparent that independence would be better for the people of the Philippines from the point of view of both their domestic concerns and their status in the world, and if when that time comes the Filipino people desire complete independence, it is not possible to doubt that the American Government and people will gladly accord it.

Mr. President, I should like to have the remainder of these statements printed in the RECORD at this point, if there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENTS BY PRESIDENTS

President McKinley gave the following instructions to the United States peace commissioners on September 16, 1898:

"Without any original thought of complete or even partial acquisition, the presence and success of our arms at Manila imposes on us obligations which we can not disregard. The march of events rules and overrules human action. Avowing unreservedly the purpose which has animated all our effort and still solicitous to adhere to it, we can not be unmindful that without any desire or design on our part the war has brought us new duties and responsibilities, which we must meet and discharge as becomes a great Nation on whose growth and career from the beginning the Ruler of Nations has plainly written the high command and pledge of civilization. * * *. In view of what has been stated the United States can not accept less than the cession in full right and sovereignty of the island of Luzon."

On October 26, 1898, Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, sent word to the United States peace commissioners as follows:

"The information which has come to the President since your departure convinces him that the acceptance of the cession of Luzon alone, leaving the rest of the islands subject to Spanish rule, or to be the subject of future contention, can not be justified on political, commercial, or humanitarian grounds. The cession must be of the whole archipelago or none. The latter is wholly inadmissible, and the former must therefore be required. The President reaches this conclusion after most thorough consideration of the whole subject and is deeply sensible of the grave responsibilities it will impose, believing that this course will entail less trouble than any other, and besides will best subserve the interests of the people involved, for whose welfare we can not escape responsibility."

President McKinley in his last annual message to Congress said: "I have on other occasions called the Filipinos the 'wards of the Nation.' Our obligation as guardian was not lightly assumed.

It must not be otherwise than honestly fulfilled, aiming first of all to benefit those who have come under our fostering care. It is our duty so to treat them that our flag may be no less beloved in the mountains of Luzon and the fertile fields of Mindanao and Negros than it is at home, and that there as here it shall be the revered symbol of liberty, enlightenment, and progress in every avenue of development."

In 1908, President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress, said: "I trust that within a generation the time will arrive when the Filipinos can decide for themselves whether it is well for them to become independent."

President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in 1904, said: "At present they are utterly incapable of existing in independence at all or building up a civilization of their own. I firmly believe that we can help them to rise higher and higher in the scale of civilization and of capacity for self-government, and I most earnestly hope that in the end they will be able to stand, if not entirely, yet in some such relation to the United States as Cuba now stands."

In his message to Congress in 1908 he said: "They have yet a long way to travel before they will be fit for complete self-government, and for deciding, as it will then be their duty to do, whether this self-government shall be accompanied by complete independence. It will probably be a generation—it may even be longer, before this point is reached; but it is most gratifying that such substantial progress toward this as a goal has already been accomplished. We desire that it be reached at as early a date as possible for the sake of the Filipinos and for our own sake, but improperly to endeavor to hurry the time will probably mean that the goal will not be attained at all."

He said: "We hope to do for them what has never before been done for any people of the Tropics—to make them fit for self-government after the fashion of the really free nations. . . . We are extremely anxious that the natives shall show the power of governing themselves. We are anxious first for their sakes and next because it relieves us of a great burden. There need not be the slightest fear of our not continuing to give them all the liberty for which they are fit."

In his message to Congress in 1901 he said: "If they are safeguarded against oppression, and if their real wants, material and spiritual, are studied intelligently and in a spirit of friendly sympathy, much more good will be done them than by any effort to give them political power, though this effort may in its own proper time and place be proper enough."

In his message to Congress in 1906 he said: "I hope and believe that these steps—setting up the Philippine Legislative Assembly—mark the beginnings of a course which will continue till the Filipinos become fit to decide for themselves whether they desire to be an independent nation."

President Wilson, in his message to Congress in December, 1920, said:

"I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled [the establishment and maintenance of a stable government] it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promises to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

In his message to Congress in 1913 he said: "We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundation thoughtfully and permanently laid."

"By their [the Philippine people] wise counsel and experience rather than by our own we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and confident tread upon it and we shall not wander from it nor linger upon it."

President Harding, in a message to the Philippine delegation in 1922, said:

"I can only commend the Philippine aspirations to independence and complete self-sovereignty. None in America would wish you to be without national aspirations. You would be unfitted for the solemn duties of self-government without them."

President Coolidge, in 1924, in a letter to the speaker of the Philippine Legislature, said:

"It is not possible to believe that the American people would wish to continue their responsibility in regard to the sovereignty and administration of the islands. It is not conceivable that they would desire, merely because they possessed the power, to continue exercising any measure of authority over a people who could better govern themselves on a basis of complete independence. . . ."

"If the time comes when it is apparent that independence would be better for the people of the Philippines from the point of view of both their domestic concerns and their status in the world, and if when that time comes the Filipino people desire complete independence, it is not possible to doubt that the American Government and people will gladly accord it."

"Finally, I feel that it (the act to hold a plebiscite relative to Philippine independence) should be disapproved, because . . . it is delaying the arrival of the day when the Philippines will have overcome the most obvious present difficulty in the way of its maintenance of an unaided government." (Letter to Governor Wood in April, 1927, sustaining veto of plebiscite bill passed by Philippine Legislature.)

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, the reason I am reading these statements is that these three distinguished Republican Presidents all made the point that the question was to be left to the desire of the people of the Philippine Islands, as expressed by themselves; and I think such a policy entirely precludes the idea of turning the Filipinos loose if they desire to remain under our flag.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.
Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator from New Mexico is the coauthor of this amendment, as he is of the bill we are considering. I think the Senator admitted awhile ago that even though we should strike out section 9 (a) in his amendment, we would still have the same question recurring in the bill.

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; that is true.
Mr. BROUSSARD. Why not eliminate it now and let that question come up when we reach it in the bill? There might be another amendment offered. There is no use to have to move twice to strike it out.

Mr. CUTTING. Of course, the whole thing hangs together. The time provided in the first part of the amendment goes with the time provided in this second part of the amendment. If the vote is against the plebiscite on the vote on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina, naturally it will be voted out of the bill at a future time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. What I am trying to do, I will say to the Senator, is to let the Senate express its opinion on the question of the plebiscite irrespective of the other questions. Some Senators may be influenced to vote for the plebiscite because they like the 12-year period. I am against both the 12-year period and the plebiscite, but some may favor the 12-year period, and yet be against the plebiscite.

I submit to the Senator that we would get a fairer expression of the will of the Senate by taking this provision out of his amendment, because it will remain in the bill, and all we will have to do then will be to change the expiration date as specified in the bill to the thirteenth year to conform to the amendment.

Mr. CUTTING. The Senator understands we are going to have a separate vote on this provision of the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to have it come first, but I should like to have it come on the section as provided in the amendment, because that naturally hangs together with the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.
Mr. LONG. As I understand, we are going to vote separately first on the plebiscite as a part of the amendment and then on the remainder of the amendment. That will accomplish what the Senator is speaking about. That is a means of doing it.

Mr. CUTTING. I have no objection to that.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that, if there be no objection, the Senate will vote first en bloc on the amendments submitted by the Senator from New Mexico and then the vote will come on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. LONG. I move that the vote on the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, by unanimous consent, be had first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LONG. I am asking unanimous consent. I do not think there is any objection to it.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Louisiana that, after examining the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, I understand that it merely changes the number of years in the section referring to the plebiscite, and therefore we can not arrive at a vote

upon the question we desire to vote upon by asking for a separate vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. Under the parliamentary situation, as I now understand it, the only way we can arrive at the vote we desire is whenever the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is perfected then to move to strike out the entire paragraph referring to the plebiscite and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill. When the amendment now offered by the Senator from New Mexico shall have been acted upon, I shall make such a motion to strike out the entire section referring to the plebiscite.

Mr. LONG. Very well; that is perfectly satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to voting on all the amendments offered by the Senator from New Mexico en bloc? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, to the committee amendment, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment reported by the Senate committee, as amended, it is proposed, on page 37, to strike out lines 8 to 25, all of pages 38, 39, and down to line 9, on page 40, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

RECOGNITION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE AND WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY

SEC. 9. (1) On the 4th day of July, immediately following the expiration of a period of 12 years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act, the President of the United States shall withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands, including all military and other reservations of the Government of the United States in the Philippines and, on behalf of the United States, shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation, and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof, under the constitution then in force: *Provided*, That the constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands has been previously amended to include the following provisions:

(2) That the property rights of the United States and the Philippine Islands shall be promptly adjusted and settled, and that all existing property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States shall be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded to the same extent as property rights of citizens of the Philippine Islands.

(3) That the government of the Philippine Islands will cede or grant to the United States land necessary for commercial base, coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States not later than two years after his proclamation recognizing the independence of the Philippine Islands.

(4) That the officials elected and serving under the constitution adopted pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be constitutional officers of the free and independent government of the Philippine Islands and qualified to function in all respects as if elected directly under such government, and shall serve their full terms of office as prescribed in the constitution.

(5) That the debts and liabilities of the Philippine Islands, its Provinces, cities, municipalities, and instrumentalities, which shall be valid and subsisting at the time of the final and complete withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States, shall be assumed by the free and independent government of the Philippine Islands; and that where bonds have been issued under authority of an act of Congress of the United States by the Philippine Islands, or any Province, city, or municipality therein, the Philippine government will make adequate provision for the necessary funds for the payment of interest and principal, and such obligations shall be a first lien on the taxes collected in the Philippine Islands.

(6) That the government of the Philippine Islands, on becoming independent of the United States, will assume all continuing obligations assumed by the United States under the treaty of peace with Spain ceding said Philippine Islands to the United States.

(7) That by way of further assurance the government of the Philippine Islands will embody the foregoing provisions (except paragraph (3)) in a treaty with the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was wondering if the Senator from South Carolina could not have achieved the result

which he desires by merely striking out from the bill or from the substitute which has been agreed upon section 9 (a).

Mr. BYRNES. It proposes, however, to insert in the bill as it is now before the Senate the exact language of the House bill in lieu of the plebiscite which, in the opinion of the members of the committee, was a proper way to present the issue squarely to the Senate for a vote.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me further, my understanding is, however, that the greater part of the amendment which he just offered is already in the Senate bill which is before us, and is also in the House bill.

Mr. BYRNES. No. By reason of the language of the amendment striking out the entire section as to the plebiscite, there would not remain in the bill any of the language that is now included in the proposed substitute offered for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the reading of the amendment, and the effect of it is to strike out all the Senate committee amendment, as printed—all of lines 21 to 24, on page 37, down to the word "report," in line 14, page 38.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. And also to strike out, on page 40, subsection (c), beginning in line 16 and running to line 24.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. And substituting in lieu thereof these words:

Sec. 9. On the 4th day of July immediately following the expiration of a period of 12 years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act, the President of the United States shall.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is it correct to say that the effect of the Senator's amendment is to eliminate the plebiscite and incorporate in the bill other provisions which would become necessary by reason of the elimination of the plebiscite?

Mr. BYRNES. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, as I understand, after the provision for the plebiscite is eliminated and certain provisions made necessary are inserted to take care of that elimination, that part of the Senate committee amendment contained on the 3, 4, or 5 pages mentioned by the Senator, dealing with debts, withdrawal, and so forth, is practically inserted verbatim as it now appears in the Senate committee amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. As I understand, the exact language is reinserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. CUTTING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Capper	Glass	Kean
Austin	Carey	Goldsborough	Kendrick
Bailey	Cohen	Gore	Keyes
Bankhead	Coolidge	Grammer	King
Barbour	Copeland	Hale	La Follette
Barkley	Costigan	Harrison	Logan
Bingham	Couzens	Hastings	Long
Black	Cutting	Hatfield	McGill
Blaine	Dale	Hawes	McKellar
Borah	Dickinson	Hayden	McNary
Broussard	Dill	Hebert	Metcalf
Bulkeley	Fess	Howell	Moses
Bulow	Frazier	Hull	Neely
Byrnes	George	Johnson	Norbeck

Nye	Robinson, Ind.	Stelwer	Walcott
Oddie	Schall	Swanson	Walsh, Mass.
Patterson	Schuyler	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, Mont.
Pittman	Shipstead	Trammell	Watson
Reed	Shortridge	Tydings	White
Reynolds	Smith	Vandenberg	
Robinson, Ark.	Smoot	Wagner	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have here a statement from the eight farm organizations setting forth their attitude on the Hawes-Cutting bill for Philippine independence. I send it to the desk and, since it is short, ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1932.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned, representatives of agricultural organizations, have before us the statements which have been made public relative to a substitute for the Hawes-Cutting bill for Philippine independence which will be proposed by the Insular Affairs Committee.

We wish to respectfully state for the information of the Senate that so far as we can ascertain this proposed substitute does not propose independence for the Philippines within the time and under the conditions which were set forth in our communication to the Members of the Senate under date of December 9, 1932, which we believe to be necessary if proper regard is given the protection of American agricultural interests.

These conditions were set forth under four points substantially as follows:

1. Complete independence should be within five years.
2. During these five years there should be either a gradual reduction each year of duty-free imports of Philippine products into the United States or a gradual application of tariff rates to be increased each year.
3. That trade relationships with the Philippine Islands at the expiration of the 5-year period should be the same as between the United States and any other country.
4. No plebiscite should be permitted to reopen the question of final independence.

We appreciate your interest in this matter.

The National Grange, by Fred Brenckman; American Farm Bureau Federation, by Chester H. Gray; Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, by John Simpson, president; National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, by Charles W. Holman; American Cotton Cooperative Association, by C. O. Moser, vice president; National Dairy Union, by A. M. Loomis; National Beet Growers' Association, by Fred Cummings; Tariff Committee of the Texas and Oklahoma Cottonseed Crushers' Association, by Clarence Ousley; American Sugar Cane League, by C. J. Bourg.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegraphic reference to the necessity for protection of our dairy interests against the Philippine coconut cow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1932.

Senator REED SMOOT,
Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate.
Congressman JAMES W. COLLIER,
Chairman of Ways and Means Committee of the House.
Congressman MARVIN JONES,
Chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House.
President HERBERT HOOVER.

Regardless of what Congress does about Philippine independence, the American dairy and livestock farmers' need is for immediate protection against present flood of copra, coconut oil, and other vegetable fats and foreign oils. Agriculture can not wait 18 years, 8 years, or even 4 years and remain solvent. Organized producers of Northwest demand immediate tariff rates of 6 cents a pound on coconut oil and 3½ cents a pound on copra with proportionate rates on palm, perilla, and other oils, and that these rates shall be immediately effective on imports from Philippines

as well as from foreign lands. No other course can effectively carry out the pledges of both parties to protect the farmer.

Dairy Record, W. A. Gordon, Editor; Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, W. S. Moscrip, President; Twin City Milk Producers' Association, W. S. Moscrip, President; Central Cooperative Commission Association, Charles Crandall, President; Land O'Lakes Creamery Association, John Brandt, President; Minnesota Creamery Operators' and Managers' Association, Leonard Houske, Secretary; North Dakota Livestock Breeders' Association, Kenneth McGregor, President; The St. Paul Farmer, H. V. Klein, Publisher; The Minneapolis Journal, Carl W. Jones, Publisher; The Minneapolis Tribune, Frederick E. Murphy, Publisher; St. Paul Dispatch Pioneer-Press, Leo E. Owens, Publisher; Minnesota Farm Bureau, A. J. Olson, President; Greater North Dakota Association, C. E. Danielson, President; Dakota Farmer, W. C. Allen, Publisher; South Dakota Livestock Breeders' Association, J. W. Wilson, President.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment in connection with the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

This proposal is to do away with a plebiscite at the end of the period of experimental government and at the end of the period of gradual assumption of a tariff wall between the Philippine Islands and the United States. It says to the 13,000,000 people of the Philippine Islands, "Although you may want independence to-day, and may so decide, if anything should happen as unexpected as a World War or a great war in the Far East during the next 8 or 10 years your fate is sealed by the first move you take, and you will have no further chance to express yourselves."

If we can conceive being asked to make a decision in 1910 that would come due in 1921, if we remember the condition of the world in 1910 and the tremendous change that took place between 1910 and 1921, we can conceive that an enormous change might take place between now and the end of the 12-year period we have just adopted.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me extremely unfair to the people of the Philippine Islands not to give them an opportunity to express their wishes in the matter as of the year when they are voting, but to require them to vote now, and then let them experiment with independence for a period of years.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate any further in this matter; but I do hope that the motion of the Senator from South Carolina will not prevail, because it seems to me that conditions in the Far East are in such a state of flux that it is impossible to say what might be the situation 10 or 12 years from now, and therefore, that it is not fair to the Filipinos to give them no opportunity to express themselves, when the time comes, as to whether or not they wish independence.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, begging the pardon of Senators who are anxious to vote, I wish in a few sentences to express my views touching the immediate matter now before us. That question is, Shall we decide the question of Filipino independence or shall Filipino independence be decided by the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands who shall be alive many, many years hence?

I hold that our paramount duty is to the people of the United States of America. I am not indifferent to the welfare of the people in the Philippines. We gave them substantial liberty, law, order, freedom. We have sheltered them, protected them, benefited them. I said that I once thought they would be eternally grateful, that they would be proud to walk under the American flag forever. I do not say that they are ungrateful, for there is inherent in a distant and set-apart people a desire to guide their own destiny; but I do say that I fear that the plant of gratitude has withered in their hearts. Gratitude is the fairest flower that sheds its fragrance in the human heart; and I fear that the Filipino people have forgotten, have ceased to be grateful. But whether the Filipino people as a people are grateful or ungrateful, I conceive it to be our duty to think first of the United States of America, of the people in this Union.

I have said, and I wish to emphasize, that it is to the interest of the United States to come out of the Orient, not

retain a sovereignty there which may involve us in war. Just as our ancestors advised us to keep out of Europe, so I think as a Government we should keep out of the Orient.

Of course, I am not indifferent to trade or commerce. I want it to flourish; and certainly, wedded as I am to the cause of peace on earth among men, I want peace to continue between us and Japan and China and all the other oriental peoples.

We promised the Filipino people to give them full independence. When were we to give it to them? When they had a stable government. They have a stable government, as stable as that which exists in many other countries of the earth. Are they capable of self-government? They are.

Mr. President, the question boils itself down to this: Who shall decide this matter of our withdrawal from the Philippines?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Does not the Senator think that there is another question just as serious as the one he is mentioning now, namely, that under the theory of the bill we are proposing to grant independence? I think everybody admits that. We will therefore gradually decrease all authority of the Federal Government of the United States up to the period when it shall cease to have any authority, while our responsibility will still continue. Yet there can not be any certainty as to what will be done after the plebiscite is taken, and consequently we will be suspended in the air, as it were, in uncertainty, all of the years. It seems to me we should not put the matter in that situation. I recognize the force of the argument that, having taken the Philippines, we should not turn them loose abruptly. But we are not doing that. We have been proceeding in an orderly manner in what we have been doing for the last 30 years and are going to continue so for a period further. Yet we do not know whether, when the period shall have ended, we will have all the responsibility and no power except as we take it. I think that particular consideration is very serious. I would rather have definiteness now.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I fully agree with the thoughts of the Senator and I thank him for expressing them. I think there should be certainty. I am not so much concerned as to just when we shall completely withdraw our control over those people, but I wish it decided now as to what we are going to do, and what we decide to do should be done out of first regard to America, not overlooking the interests of the Filipino people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not likely that if the election were held now it would result in a more accurate expression of the Filipino people than if held after 15 years?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I agree with the thought expressed by the Senator. If it be argued, as it has been argued, that the Filipino people shall be given opportunity to determine whether they wish independence now, this bill gives them that opportunity. It gives them the opportunity to express themselves, when an election shall be called and held, in respect of the constitution to be submitted to them.

Are they competent to decide that question for themselves? The learned Senator from New Mexico observed that we were recognizing the representatives of the Philippine Islands in the presentation of their claim for independence. That is true. They do, I think, speak for the Filipino people, and they are not asking for independence 20 years from now, nor are they asking that this matter be deferred for 20 years for final decision by them.

I can not too strongly express my opinion that it is our duty to keep our promise; that it is our duty to decide this question; that it is our duty to decide this question now; and, hence, that we should not defer the decision of this question of independence for 15 or 20 years, to be decided then by a generation now unborn.

What will happen when an election is called 20 years from now? Who knows? The gentlemen here represent-

ing the Philippines, men of capacity, who have argued and pleaded and prayed for independence, will have passed beyond the scene. New men will come on, new interests will have been developed, and it may well be that commercial, economic interests will take a lively concern in an election to be called 20 years from now and, it is conceivable, defeat the proposition of giving Filipino independence. Then where would we be?

I repeat that my chief objection to this bill as it was first submitted to the Senate, my main objection, was as to the deferring of a decision of this question of independence. I have been misunderstood, not purposely misrepresented by the press, but misunderstood, and I want to make my position perfectly clear that my opposition to the bill from the beginning was grounded chiefly on this deferred plebiscite vote as provided in the bill.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will decide this question. We have the power to decide it, notwithstanding the learned and earnest argument of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who questions our constitutional power to withdraw our sovereignty. With respect for him and for others, I think we have the constitutional power to pass a bill such as this, and to retire, withdraw, from the Philippines; and I feel that we should decide the question for the American people, and out of first regard for the American people.

I may not be able to vote on the pending motion because of an existing pair, and it is for that reason I have troubled the Senate with my final words on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. FESS. Several Senators are absent who want to be present when the vote is taken. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Schall
Austin	Dale	Keyes	Schuyler
Bailey	Dickinson	King	Shipstead
Bankhead	Dill	La Follette	Shortridge
Barbour	Fess	Logan	Smith
Barkley	Frazier	Long	Smoot
Bingham	George	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Glass	McKellar	Swanson
Blaine	Gore	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Grammer	Metcalf	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Tydings
Bulkley	Harrison	Neely	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hastings	Norbeck	Wagner
Byrnes	Hatfield	Nye	Walcott
Capper	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Howell	Reed	White
Copeland	Hull	Reynolds	
Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	
Couzens	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is upon the amendment offered by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word more to those who are in favor of the pending amendment. I have already stated the reasons why I shall vote against it, but I would like to remind Senators that the amendment is going to make it extremely difficult to get the measure enacted into law, in view of the attitude taken by advisers of the President in the hearings before the committee. Without any knowledge of the actual situation or any authority to speak for the administration, it appears evident to those who have studied the position taken by the

President's advisers, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War, the one in connection with our relations in the Far East and the other in connection with our relations in the Philippines themselves, that the adoption of this amendment would unquestionably lead to a veto by the President.

I merely want to say to those who are anxious to get the bill passed and to get Philippine independence, that from information which we received during the hearings, both in the public hearings and in executive hearings, it appears to me very likely that the adoption of the amendment will lead to no legislation at all during the present session of Congress. I am not in any way stating that except for the information of Senators. It is in no sense a threat because I have no authority to make it except from my own judgment based on what has gone on before the committee. I think some members of the committee will agree with me that adoption of the amendment will make it impossible to secure passage of a Philippine independence bill at this session of Congress.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Is it fair for the Senator to make such a statement without telling what information he has about the bill not being approved?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have given the Senate the information I have.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I was a member of the committee. I would not come here and give as a reason for somebody voting one way or another something that is couched in such terms as that anybody might place his own interpretation upon the statement. If the Senator has information which he would like other Senators to have, every Senator is entitled to have it; otherwise he should not refer to it. I ask the Senator to state to the Senate why the bill would not be approved.

Mr. BINGHAM. In reply to that may I invite the Senator's attention to testimony given before the committee by the Secretary of State in regard to the effect on conditions in the Far East and the situation likely to arise in the Far East. That in itself would lead me to believe, and I am stating it as frankly as I can on my own interpretation of the facts, though the Senator may place a different interpretation upon it, that it would undoubtedly be the duty of the Secretary of State to advise the President against the signing of any such bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. What has the Secretary of State to do with the bill after we pass it?

Mr. BINGHAM. Only as adviser to the President. I am only anxious to warn those who are working toward the passage of some bill that the adoption of this amendment will make it practically impossible to get any bill.

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Utah begins his remarks will he yield to me to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. KING. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The Senator from Connecticut keeps intimating that the President will veto the bill if we strike out the plebiscite. That is what the Senator from Connecticut is saying in effect. Is not that so?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; that is so.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And that because the Secretary of War thinks he knows more about the Government than the Senator does or than the Senate does.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit it does not make any difference what the President does, we ought to go ahead and vote on the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, not infrequently, I regret to say, statements are made in the Senate similar to those just made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] to the effect that measures under consideration, if passed, containing certain features would meet with Executive disap-

proval. In my opinion the action of Senators, and for that matter Members of the House of Representatives, should not be controlled by the reported attitude toward proposed legislation of the President of the United States. Disclaiming any purpose to be critical of the Senator from Connecticut or any other Senator, it seems to me that appeals of this character should not influence Senators. Under the Constitution the authority of the President is clearly defined and the duties of the legislative branch of the Government are likewise clearly indicated. It is unnecessary to point out to Senators that under the tripartite division of power provided in the Constitution the functions of the legislative branch are distinct from those of the Executive and the authority of the President is distinct and separate from that appertaining to the legislative branch.

Senators have a duty to perform, and they may not abdicate that responsibility without departing from the line of duty. Congress may not interfere with the President in the discharge of his constitutional duties and the President has no right to interfere with the Congress in the discharge of the responsibilities resting upon it. Senators should vote upon legislative questions before them without having in mind the attitude of the Executive. They may not excuse themselves from legislative responsibility by taking refuge behind the Executive. If Senators believe this measure to be just and called for by existing conditions, they should vote for its passage, regardless of the reported attitude of the President of the United States. If Congress passes this or any measure, the President has the right, if it does not meet his views, to veto it. Congress may pass measures which are not fair or just or do not meet conditions with which they are supposed to deal. Congress may make mistakes, as is frequently the case, and the President may be entirely right in vetoing measures; but I repeat, Congress should not be deterred from passing measures because of the fear or threats or conviction that Executive disapproval awaits the same.

Even if Congress should be assured that the President would veto this or any bill, I submit that such assurance should not prevent an affirmative action upon the part of the House or the Senate. Indeed, it seems to me that Congress should accept the challenge of a threatened veto and pass any measure that under all the circumstances they regarded as necessary, just, and proper. Of course, there should be comity and cordial relations among the various departments of the Government, and a due regard for the rights, authority, and indeed dignity of each branch of the departments of the Government. If the President should veto an act of Congress, as he has a right to do, his message disapproving of the same might furnish convincing evidence of the wisdom and propriety of his course. In that event it would probably be the duty of Congress to adjust their course to the views of the Executive.

If the pending measure should pass Congress and meet an Executive veto, Senators, as well as Members of the House, might become convinced of their error and modify the bill so far as to remove the objections indicated by the President.

The question before us is what measure does the Senate believe to be just and fair and required by the situation before us. We are not confronted at the moment with the proposition as to what form of bill is desired by him. It is true under the Constitution he has the right to make recommendations to Congress, but the responsibility rests upon Congress to deal with the question as it sees fit. President Wilson, in the last message he delivered to Congress, pointed out that the Filipinos had established a stable form of government and were entitled to the liberty which they coveted. Congress did not see fit to pass a measure in harmony with the suggestions of the President. I do not recall that President Hoover has made any recommendation touching the independence of the Philippines. Indeed, the Senator from Connecticut has not assigned as a reason for defeating the motion submitted by the Senator from South Carolina, that the President was opposed to the same or that the Presi-

dent desired the bill under consideration to contain a provision for a plebiscite within 14 or 20 years after an autonomous government had been established in the Philippines.

The Senator from Connecticut frankly admits that he is not authorized to speak for the President in this matter, nor does he state that the President will veto the bill should the plebiscite provision be eliminated. He rests his statement as to the possibility or probability of Executive disapproval upon statements made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State. It may be that there is such a close connection between the President and the two Secretaries referred to that they may be regarded as his representatives and spokesmen. I doubt, however, that these distinguished Cabinet officers claim to have represented the President in the statements which they made before the committees of the House and Senate. Undoubtedly they expressed their convictions upon this important question.

Their views, of course, are entitled to due consideration, and I have no doubt the committees of both the House and Senate gave due weight to the same. Concede that these officials are opposed to this bill or to the granting of independence to the Filipinos within reasonable time or at all, it can not be argued that Congress should be concluded by their attitude and thus delay legislation dealing with the Philippine question.

I mean no discourtesy to the able Secretary of War when I say that I do not think upon the important matter of Philippine independence the President will accept him as his mentor and follow his reasoning or his conclusions. The question before us is a vital one. It has not only political and economic implications and consequences, but back of it and as a part of it are fundamental questions relating to the theory of our Government and to its obligations not only to its nationals but to those who may have been brought under its authority. Other governments may not furnish precedents for the determination of problems arising under our republican form of government. Our Constitution, impregnated as I believe it to be with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, has developed a philosophy of government at variance with that which prevails in many countries. Under our theory of government the consent of the governed must be obtained in order to assert sovereignty and exercise governmental authority. Our fathers did not conceive of territory being annexed in order that it might be governed as European nations govern colonial possessions. They did not conceive of a divided nationality or nationalism. They believed that wherever the Constitution went the rights and immunities provided by it were to be enjoyed and exercised. I think it may be said that it was their view that if for any reason the Republic should adventure upon a policy of expansion, as a part of that policy there should be carried the Constitution with all of its implications and its privileges and immunities.

I have stated that the question before us is a vital one. It not only affects the interest of our nationals but it affects the honor and good name of this Republic. The paramount or controlling question is not what will prove most beneficial in a material way to the people of the United States. Some persons reading the debates that have occurred since this bill has been before the Senate might infer that an important question for consideration was what would be most advantageous materially to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the most important questions in life, whether relating to individuals or governments, are not those dealing with financial or utilitarian or material things. We should inquire now, What does justice and the highest ethical concepts require? What should our Government as an honorable nation do in dealing with 13,000,000 people upon whom we have imposed political rule? We can not afford to take any step or adopt any policy that would subject us to a charge of selfishness or would be a blot upon the escutcheon of our Nation. The vital question is not what certain business or industrial or agricultural interests demand, but what under all the circumstances would be for the best interests of the Filipinos and what in all

honor and in conformity with their wishes should the United States do.

Certainly the President's course will not be determined by the views of the able Secretary of War that independence must be postponed until certain standards, uncertain, undefined, undetermined, shall be reached. The only standard suggested by Congress was that the Filipinos should establish a stable form of government, and when that goal had been reached they should have absolute independence. That goal, a President of the United States said, had been reached. Many persons familiar with the economic and political conditions in the Philippine Islands affirm that a stable government has been established.

No one authorized the Secretary of War or any other person to create or establish some other criterion or formulate this and other standards that must be attained preliminary to Philippine independence. Upon a previous occasion I referred to this shadowy and uncertain standard which it was contended must now be reached as a *sine qua non* for Philippine independence, and I remarked that if that was to be the test of independence, Philippine independence would be postponed indefinitely. Those who insist that the freedom of the Philippines shall not be attained until and unless economic conditions are absolutely stable, so stable as to insure political stability, are demanding that the settlement of the Philippine question shall be referred to future generations. Those who are demanding what they call "economic stability" concede that there is a stable government in the Philippine government; that there is peace and order, and that progressive policies are being carried into execution under which a high degree of civilization has been attained.

In this changing world, with economic confusion and disorder regnant in many countries, who can define economic stability? Many nations are unable to meet their internal and external obligations. Some governments of more or less importance are defaulting in the payments of their obligations. By reason of reactionary and parochial policies adopted by many countries international trade and commerce have been so restricted and the currents of progress so arrested and diverted from proper channels, that many nations do not have stable governments politically or economically. It is recognized that political conditions are inseparably connected with economic conditions, and it is a truism that when there are sound political conditions there are reasonably sound and satisfactory economic conditions. If many existing governments are recognized as they are by this Republic, as well as by the great family of nations, and such recognition is based upon economic stability, then the Philippines are entitled to an independent government and to be admitted into the council of nations.

Reference has been made by the Senator from Connecticut to the position of the Secretary of State. The latter did not favor the pending measure for Philippine independence within a short time because of the confused situation in the Orient.

Mr. President, there are many who favor Philippine independence because of the unsatisfactory situation in the Orient. However, if the Filipinos are to wait the settlement of oriental problems, they may not have independence during this century. No one can foretell what the future has in store for China and Japan and India. China to-day has internal troubles of a most serious character. A considerable part of China is in the hands of communist organizations which deny the authority of the Nanking or the Cantonese government. The recognition of the Bolshevik government by the Nanking government may strengthen the communistic movement in China and contribute to further demoralization, if not disintegration of government, in that unhappy land. There is no evidence of a speedy settlement of the controversies between Japan and China. I repeat that the Orient does not promise an early settlement of existing controversies. Shall the troubles of Japan and China and the communists of Russia constitute barriers to Philippine independence? I submit that the views of the Secretary of State should not control the Senate in its action upon the

measure before us. No President of the United States has announced that Philippine independence depended upon economic stability or upon the economic or political conditions existing in the Orient. From President McKinley down to President Hoover the view has been directly or indirectly expressed that when the Filipinos attained that position that they were competent to govern themselves, that is when they had established a stable government, they were entitled to independence.

The Senator from New Mexico a few minutes ago referred to a statement made by Theodore Roosevelt to the effect that within a generation from the date of the statement if the Filipinos desired their independence, they were entitled to the same. A generation has elapsed since that statement was made, and we have incontrovertible evidence of a unanimous demand upon the part of the Filipinos that they be permitted to establish a government of their own choice and be absolutely emancipated from the control of the United States.

Mr. President, since the Secretaries of the State and Navy Departments testified before the Senate and House committees, an election has been had in the United States and the American people expressed their views upon the policies of the present administration. It is true that the Philippine question was not a major issue; indeed, it was not regarded as important except in certain agricultural regions and in certain industrial sections where the Federation of Labor had many adherents. Senators know that many of the farmers of the United States declared in favor of absolute and immediate independence for the Philippines. Many labor representatives opposed the migration of Filipinos to the United States and urged that the Filipinos be permitted to set up a government of their own choice. There was a general feeling that the party which prevailed in the election was more favorable to Philippine independence than the party now in power. At any rate many of the American people believed that the time had come for a severance of the ties binding the two countries, and they are urging now the passage of a measure that will enable the Filipinos within a short time to establish an independent government.

Mr. President, I can not believe but that the President of the United States will sign a bill granting independence to the Filipinos provided that its terms are reasonable and just. I have no doubt that President Hoover is concerned in the welfare of the Filipinos and that he will look with favor upon any measure that seeks to redeem the promises made by his predecessors and by Congress. I have no doubt that he desires that this Republic should deal with this question in an honorable way, consonant with the highest principles of morality and justice and having in mind primarily the welfare and happiness and freedom of the Filipino people.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment under consideration and hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am going to vote against the provision for a plebiscite, and in doing so I want to say that I do not intend any reflection upon the conscientious work of the committee. I am for independence for the Philippines, but under the processes of plebiscites, five in number, it seems to me independence becomes such a cumbersome, intricate, and complicated affair that I am fairly well convinced, in my own mind, that there will come no independence for the Philippines out of it.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. Did I understand the Senator to say that there will be five plebiscites?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. There will be five votes, as I understand.

Mr. CUTTING. How does the Senator reach that conclusion? The only votes that I know of are the vote on the constitution, to be taken shortly after the beginning of the interim period, and the final plebiscite of the people.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The legislative body of the Philippines also has to cast some votes.

Mr. CUTTING. The legislature ratifies the act we pass. Then they call a constitutional convention.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And the constitution is to be adopted.

Mr. CUTTING. And the constitution is to be adopted by the people.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then there is to be an election of officials.

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; under their constitution I suppose they will have general elections, such as they now have, for that matter.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Including legislative ratification necessary and the elections and the question of adopting the constitution, there are five votes to be taken, as I understand, if I am not misinformed.

Mr. CUTTING. There may be many more than that if one counts each election they are going to have during the interim period. The Senator understands that they have elections anyway; but the only two popular votes provided for in this bill are the one on the adoption of the constitution at the beginning of the interim period and the plebiscite on final independence at the end of the period.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The adoption of the constitution is necessary.

Mr. CUTTING. That is left to the people of the Philippine Islands; yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That vote, of course, is necessary.

Mr. CUTTING. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then, the amendment will strike out only the provision for the last plebiscite.

Mr. CUTTING. It will strike out only the provision for the last plebiscite, which the committee felt was necessary in order to ascertain the wishes of the Philippine people at the time they had had their experience and at the time when freedom was about to be accepted or rejected.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand the viewpoint of the committee, and I say, with due respect to the committee, that I am going to vote to eliminate the provision for the last plebiscite.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULOW (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. COPELAND (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. HEBERT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement as to my general pair, and not being advised how the Senator with whom I am paired would vote on this question, I must withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "aye."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KEAN. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] is necessarily detained from the Senate. He is paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY].

Mr. McKELLAR. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I do not know how he would vote, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON];

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are absent on official business.

I also wish to repeat the announcement that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are absent in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett.

I also wish to repeat the announcement that on this question the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], who is absent in attendance upon the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas, is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—33

Ashurst	Carey	Howell	Schall
Bankhead	Cohen	Kendrick	Schuyler
Barkley	Costigan	King	Shipstead
Black	Dickinson	Logan	Smith
Blaine	Dill	McGill	Smoot
Borah	Fess	Neely	Walsh, Mont.
Broussard	George	Norbeck	
Byrnes	Glass	Oddie	
Capper	Hatfield	Reynolds	

NAYS—35

Austin	Frazier	Kean	Reed
Bailey	Gore	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.
Barbour	Grammer	Long	Tydings
Bingham	Harrison	McNary	Vandenberg
Bulkeley	Hastings	Metcalf	Wagner
Coolidge	Hawes	Moses	Walcott
Couzens	Hayden	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hebert	Patterson	Watson
Dale	Johnson	Pittman	

NOT VOTING—28

Bratton	Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson
Brookhart	Glenn	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Goldsbrough	Robinson, Ind.	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Hale	Sheppard	Townsend
Connally	Hull	Shortridge	Trammell
Copeland	Keyes	Steiwer	Wheeler
Davis	Lewis	Stephens	White

So the amendment of Mr. BYRNES to the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). That motion will be entered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, we do not care for this bill at all. We do not want this bill. We are not going to have this bill in its present shape, with this plebiscite in it.

This vote was 34 to 34 before my vote was changed. We do not intend to have an election held in the city square of Wall Street over whether or not the Philippines are to have independence 20 years from now. If they want to hold an election in the Philippine Islands as to whether or not they want a government of their own, we are willing to have one held there but we do not intend to have 20 years go by, and have investment after investment made in the Philippines, and have political tie-ups made, and have an election held over in the Orient 20 years from now, with any such uncertainty as that.

I am prepared to discuss this matter for a while.

Mr. President, some one evidently has made a mistake in the way he intended to vote on this amendment.

To begin with—I want to be leisurely about this; I do not want anybody to try to follow my thoughts hastily expressed—I was a little bit surprised at some of the votes that were cast in this matter. If we could have foreseen it,

I do not know whether some of us would have been nearly so agreeable as we have been the last couple or three days. I know I would not have been. Rather than to have a bill here that ties us up in such a way that the next Congress can not change this matter, rather than to have the Philippine-independence situation tied up in a bill that we can not change for 15 years, we prefer no legislation at all at this time, because this does not mean any Philippine independence at all. You can not conceive of a bill that you could draft that would come nearer to defeating the cause of Philippine independence than to put in the bill a provision that 20 years from now they shall vote on whether they will or will not become an independent nation.

The investments made in the Philippines have increased at an alarming rate. The fact that three of your Republican Presidents, and all of our Democratic platforms for the last 20 years have been in favor of freedom for the Philippine Islands has not kept the American imperialist from extending his investments into the Philippine Islands. They have gone and increased the production of sugar from 300,000 tons to 500,000 tons, to where the committee which came in here with this bill recommended that they be allowed to increase it up to 850,000 tons; and we have been informed that already this year they have imported 920,000 tons of free sugar from the Philippine Islands against the agricultural interests of this country that are to-day struggling and begging for something to eat, and are being fed by a dole from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

If we put this bill through now, when our Democratic administration comes in here in March we can not change it one jot nor tittle. We can not change it at all. It will have to stand just as it is. If we have to write a bill of this kind under the searchlight of the present occupant of the White House, we do not want to write a Philippine independence bill. If he is requiring that it be molded to suit his lame-duck session that has only a couple or three months to remain here, if we have to write this bill in the light of what the American people have repudiated instead of what the American people have asked for, we will wait here 90 days to get a bill for the freedom of the Philippine Islands.

I do not intend, for one, that a man who can occupy the White House but 60 days longer—the longest 60 days the American people may ever see—shall have his ipse dixit that he will veto a bill influence the kind of legislation that is going to be enacted, if I can help it, especially when it is a bill that affects the welfare and the lives of the people of the State of Louisiana as this bill does.

What do they raise in Mississippi, in Arkansas, and in Alabama but cotton? The cotton farmer to-day is on his back. The cotton farmer to-day is not asking for normalcy. He is not asking for the right to have more imports or exports than he has had. He is asking merely for anything like the equivalent of half normalcy. Yet we propose here to give the Philippine Islands the right to ship into this country an increased amount of the coconut-oil and vegetable-oil products with which the farmer of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas is struggling to compete to-day.

We do not care for this kind of a bill. The fact of the case is, I do not think we are going to have any such bill as this. So far as I am concerned, we will not.

We have been promising freedom to the Philippine Islands. We are contending here with two factions. One element does not want the Philippine Islands freed at all. That is the element that is voting for the plebiscite. We have had to stand here and try to vote down the element that does not want the Philippine Islands to be free. If the strength of the committee that says it wants to undertake the freedom of the Philippine Islands has to be compromised and added to the strength of the element that does not want them freed at all in order to give a majority here for a plebiscite, which in every workable effect means that there is going to be no Philippine freedom and no Philippine-freedom legislation for the next 20 years, if that is the kind of status the people are up against, we will wait for the

sunrise here on the 4th day of March to get a bill that is approved by the American people.

Sixty days is not long. In fact, I feel that 60 days' discussion would do the Senate good.

Mr. President, a short time ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], after a quorum call, when we were about to take a vote, in order, as he stated, that Senators who had not been present could hear something he had to say, gave us to understand that the President would veto this bill. His utterance rang through the Chamber. That is what we are given to understand—that the President will veto the bill if it is passed without the plebiscite. We are told that on the ground that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State will recommend to the President that the bill be vetoed.

If that is the case, Mr. President, if it is true that the President is going to do what Mr. Hurley recommends that he shall do, then we might just as well cease our efforts to-day. There is no need of going any farther with this matter if it is going to be necessary that we adopt legislation that in the mind of the Secretary of War leads to a situation where Philippine independence can be prevented, because it means that we will have passed a bill that the Secretary of War knows means no independence; and then our hands and our feet will have been tied, and we will not be able to pass any legislation to change this status when the Democratic Party takes charge of this country on the 4th day of March.

When we pass this bill, the imperialist has 20 years in which to work. The imperialist who does not want the Philippine Islands to be freed has 20 years in which to work when we pass this bill. There can be no change in the status in 20 years. I say "20 years." The amendment will probably provide for about 14 or 15 years, or perhaps 16 years; but at least for four presidential terms, when we have passed this law, the elements that have invested their money there will have an unchangeable status there. I may also state that they have already gotten their money out. Most of those that invested a dollar there made a dollar and a quarter the year they invested it. Most of them did. Maybe some of them did not; but the elements that have invested their money there will start out on a political campaign in which they will have the finances and will milk the resources out of the Filipino and out of the American farmer for the next 20 years to a point where, to save time, the ballot box had better be placed under the dome of the National City Bank and the Chase National Bank and the various bond and investment houses of Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., rather than to have it sent 10,000 miles away to the Philippine Islands in order to hold an election.

The cotton farmer of the South is broke. He is prostrate. He is flat. He is not able to carry on a campaign 10,000 miles away in the Orient. He is not able to fight an election for 15 years. The same situation prevails to-day with regard to the cane farmer. We have seen tears falling in the Senate Chamber as big as a crocodile could shed for the future welfare of the Philippines, and I am in sympathy with every word that is said for the welfare and the uplift of the Filipinos; but, with all the tears and sorrows and weeping that have followed, nobody has ever talked about the status of the American farmer and the American people as affected by the freedom of the Philippine Islands.

A little longer than 30 years ago we had up a great agitation about Cuban freedom. We sent our soldiers across that stretch of ocean and fought the Spanish for the freedom of the Cubans. My friend from Nevada says we fought them because they blew up the *Maine*. That may be true; but we were supposed to be in a fight to free Cuba. We freed Cuba. I am informed that about \$700,000,000 of American money has been invested in Cuba. We have put a tariff on sugar coming from Cuba—a tariff of 2 cents a pound, 20 per cent under that charged upon sugar coming from other countries. Cuba to-day sends the bulk of its sugar to America. Somewhere between 44 and 50 per cent of the sugar imported into this country comes from the isle of Cuba. That sugar pays a tariff of 2 cents a pound.

That is Cuba. There are men buried to-day who fought for the independence of Cuba. There are men sitting in this Chamber to-day who came back, who offered their lives for the purpose of freeing Cuba; but the greatest thing about it, as the imperialist views it, greater than the lives, Mr. President, is the fact that there were American dollars invested in Cuba.

I am undertaking to appeal to the legislative mind. I am not undertaking to appeal to the legislative mind on the weak score of lives that have been sacrificed, but on dollars of the American imperialist that have been invested. I know that will strike a more responsive chord, based upon some of the arguments I have heard here. I am undertaking to argue this matter from the standpoint of Cuba based upon dollars that have been invested in Cuba.

We have invested \$700,000,000 in the isle of Cuba and are to-day dependent upon the sales of sugar from the isle of Cuba for anything like a reasonable return or for a recouping of the investment.

What is the philosophy of this bill? We have heard a great deal about the philosophy of the bill. What is the philosophy that takes a strangle hold on \$700,000,000 of money invested in the isle of Cuba, brings Cuban sugar in here with a tariff of 2 cents a pound, with \$700,000,000 of American money invested in Cuba, when Filipino sugar is brought into this country free of any tariff?

What is the justice as between the two foreign countries, the Philippines and Cuba? I say "foreign" only to indicate that they are not American countries. What is the difference between the two, for one of which we fought a war, that the Cuban is made to pay 2 cents a pound to send sugar into the United States, and the Filipino can send sugar into the United States without paying a copper cent?

Mr. President, we are not satisfied with the result of this situation here. We did not think this was to be the result. Faces in this Chamber appear to change very suddenly. I am a country boy, away from home. I thought I knew something about this business. I helped rock the baby to sleep, to get a compromise. I undertook to help get a compromise, and I find that the compromise is all right as long as those with whom we are laboring are getting what they want.

I have ears that evidently are somewhat twisted, so that sounds do not get into them correctly. If I understood the sounds correctly, I understood I was to get a few votes on this side for striking out this plebiscite provision, which votes I did not get. I understood that to have been told me. I am now informed that I misunderstood somebody. Then those I am supposed to have misunderstood, misunderstood me.

We do not care for any bill that carries on Philippine uncertainty and farther. I want to say, further, that when an agreement is given in this Chamber or out of this Chamber, whenever I am left under the impression, whether it is through my mistake or not, that if one thing is done another thing is going to be done, and the other thing is not done, I am going to undertake to correct that situation. I want Senators on this floor to understand that I was telling them what I honestly believed when I told them that without any question this plebiscite provision was going to be stricken out of this bill. That is what I thought, and that is what we intend.

There is a great deal to be said on this question. I never have felt that I did justice to my constituents in not extending my remarks in this matter. I felt that I owed it to them to give the Senate some history. The fact of the matter is that I felt that I should have discussed the constitutional question, which my friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] so elaborately debated here in this Chamber for several days. But I refrained from a discussion of the constitutional features of the bill. It may be that some one was influenced to vote against the plebiscite feature as a result of the very splendid argument made by the Senator from New York. Frankly, Mr. President, I did not think there were many Senators who would be taken in by the argument, but there might have been some.

Therefore, I will delve into a discussion of the constitutional features of this matter.

I will discuss the subject from the standpoint of direct and indirect and abstract principles of fundamental and statutory law. I will start out by discussing the constitutional features of the case. I will then discuss the amendments to the Constitution and the history of the amendments. Then I will discuss the statutes, and some time to-morrow I intend to take up the argument made by the Senator from New York, after I have laid the groundwork to go into the matter. Then, after this matter has been thoroughly understood, I hope to call for a vote, provided nobody else wants to speak.

The Constitution of the United States, gentlemen of the Senate, as we all know, was adopted after considerable debate as to what would be the imperialistic policy of the United States. The first great question which arose was whether or not the third President—Thomas Jefferson—could purchase the Louisiana Territory. In this Chamber we see such Senators as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Be it said, Mr. President, that the United States Government did not want to get North Dakota at the time of which I am speaking; they did not want Michigan at that time; but in order to get our people of Louisiana, they yielded and agreed to take into the United States North Dakota, Michigan, Arkansas, and other territory. We were the means by which others found entrance into this Union. Some think it was a mistake to do that at that time. I do not. I think it was a good thing, viewing what happened on the 8th day of last November. I think it was a good thing to take Michigan into the Union, viewing the returns on November 8, and, from the same consideration, it was a good thing to take the Dakotas into the Union.

The policy Mr. Jefferson adopted at that time in extending the original territory of the thirteen Colonies, in taking in the Isle of Orleans—which is what Jefferson wanted to buy—caused him to spread the all-embracing arms of the American Government over a territory much larger than the territory which originally adopted the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, that is supposed to have ended the matter. When we took in the Louisiana Purchase Territory, so far as our history has divulged, that was an end to the question. But our historians have been sadly lacking in supplying the truth to the American people as to just when it was that the Louisiana Purchase Territory was truly, legally, rightfully, and, I might say, through might, made an irretrievable part of the United States of America.

When was it? It was not done in the treaty made with Napoleon; it was not in the ratification or in the purchase, not entirely; but the title of the United States to the Louisiana Purchase accrued on the 8th day of January, 1815, and history has left that story out up to this time; so I propose now to write into history what has been left out for more than 125 years.

I propose, therefore, Mr. President, to turn back now and start 125 years ago, and then travel steadily up until I reach the speech of the Senator from New York. I, therefore, have a starting point from which to argue this question—something the Senator from New York never had. I have a place from which I can begin.

There was no war down in Louisiana in 1812. It is true the army came here and burned up Washington, and a lot of people have thought it should not have been allowed to be rebuilt. It is true the army did get down here and burn up a few shacks around Washington and mess up things around on the eastern coast; but there was no war going on in Louisiana, where there were peace, quiet, and contentment; where a homogeneous people went to and fro exchanging the commodities necessary for life with their neighbors, mingled with all peoples and all races and kinds, and brought together the people from the Orient, from the South Seas, from Central America, from South America, from Europe; but there was still no war.

However, peace was about to be declared between England and the United States, and that was the cause of war in

New Orleans. It was not because of the war between England and the United States that Pakenham's army was sent 1,500 miles away to New Orleans. It was because peace was about to be declared that the flower of the British Army was landed in the city of New Orleans, under the brother-in-law of the Duke of Wellington. It was because our treaty makers at Ghent had been gradually forced back from the mark, until they had allowed the treaty to be so written and so framed that England refused to recognize the right of Napoleon to sell the Louisiana Purchase Territory to the United States of America. Go back and review the treaty of Ghent to-day, go back and review the letters of Gen. Andrew Jackson, and you will find that in the settlement of the War of 1812 the American people were forced to allow England to make a settlement which would not recognize the right of Napoleon to sell the Louisiana Purchase Territory to the United States.

Therefore, with a treaty on its way for signing, with a treaty on its way to the United States, Pakenham's army, under a British general, was landed in New Orleans, so that when that treaty was promulgated and made effective under the law of nations, Pakenham would be in possession of the territory, with the British Union Jack flying over it, territory which had not been conceded to the United States under the treaty made with England. So Pakenham's army was landed in New Orleans for treaty purposes.

Then it was that hastily this country was made the great cradle of liberty, which my friends the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nevada now talk about bestowing upon the Filipinos 10,000 miles away. I am pleading for the people and the children of the people who made Missouri part of the American Republic and gave the children of that State the right to call themselves Americans.

We do not have to go 10,000 miles to find somebody to cry about. We can find the boys and the girls and the men and the women in the State of Louisiana to-day, descendants of those who defeated the flower of the British Army and gave the people of these other States their status as Americans, to-day crying for bread, crying for a right to live, crying for something to eat and something to wear, because they have been rendered absolutely penniless through the expenditures made by the American Government to give advantage to an oriental people, to allow them to ship their products into our country, with every wall torn down, with every discrimination on the face of the earth against the people of our country. I want to discuss this matter seriatim. I want to give the historical phases of this case, because it will soon be January 8. I have accepted an invitation to go to Missouri for the inauguration of the governor on January 8 in recognition of the community of friendship existing between this common family that came into a common accord.

Gen. Andrew Jackson, landing in New Orleans two or three companies of Tennessee mountain riflemen, dug up an army from pirates led by Jean Lafitte, and a few more of every kind of people and manner of men, creoles, the French people of the State of Louisiana, and the people of New Orleans, and won a victory on the 8th day of January, 1815, killing more than 2,000 of the flower of the British Army, the Americans losing only 8 or 10 men, which forced the army of Great Britain to give up its possession of the Territory of Louisiana, and to embark for the other side of the ocean where a few months later the same army defeated Napoleon at Waterloo. It was enough army to defeat Napoleon at Waterloo, but it was not enough army to defeat the people of the State of Louisiana with a few helpers from Tennessee under the leadership of Gen. Andrew Jackson.

Now, Mr. President, that is the means I wish to place before my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I have taken a few minutes' time to give the means and methods by which the purchase of Louisiana was perfected. I hope the Senate will not think that I am unnecessarily laborious in presenting this matter. We have been denied our place in history on this question. It has never been told in its full view. Only now have the people of my country been given the right to have this thing fully

explained in a forum from which it will be heralded, we hope, to the remote corners of all States. Only now has historical justice seen the beginning of the truth-shedding light permeating to the four corners of this continent that they might understand how there was brought into this Union and made a great country that vast territory between the Rocky Mountains and the Mississippi River and extending from the Canadian line down to the Gulf.

That brings us up to the 8th of January, 1815. There were kindly disposed people who came to that country following that time. Some of the best citizens came down from the New England States, some from Maine in the far-away North, kindly disposed people, and our people were kindly disposed toward them. I remember a tradition that has been told me at the fireside by my grandfather about some young man who opened a saloon in one of the towns there. I was told by my grandfather that one of our uncles formed a friendship with this young man and, seeing that he had not learned how to mix drinks, volunteered his time and stood there all day long in that saloon teaching that young man how to mix drinks. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must admonish occupants of the galleries that manifestations of approval or disapproval are not permitted under the rules.

Mr. LONG. From those friendships and associations there sprang up mutual love, regard, and respect that a thousand centuries hence can never undermine. Gradually the constant associations and accumulations of those people—but I believe I skipped a point there. Prior to that time there had been five amendments adopted to the Constitution of the United States, but none of them touched this question. They dealt with various and sundry rights ordinarily accorded to the English-speaking people, extended by the gratuitous King John to the English people. But in the year 1815, the title having been confirmed to America and America becoming possessed of the desirables and undesirables—and I wish to say that I mean no reflections upon the balance of the people who came in with this purchase.

Personally speaking, we were glad to have them brought in with us. We were willing to associate with them. The complaint came from the other part of the country. So far as we were concerned down there in the Isle of Orleans, we were perfectly willing to take in those people. We thought they would make good citizens. We did not ask them to wait. We did not send them any plebiscite. There never was any plebiscite given the people of Louisiana as to whether we wanted to come in or not, much less one to North Dakota and Missouri. There has never been any plebiscite taken in Missouri yet as to whether they wanted to become a part of the United States. That may have been neglected. I do not know how the vote would go today, but there never was a plebiscite taken at that time to determine whether we would or would not take in that flowery region of sunlight homes and happiness and abundance—there never was a plebiscite taken from the people of Louisiana as to whether they would accept status as a part of the American Colonies. So that does away with the plebiscite so far as we are concerned.

Did we take any plebiscite when we took the Filipinos into the United States? A great deal has been said that we have to wait 15 years for a plebiscite in the Philippine Islands. We did not have any plebiscite when we took them into the United States. We had to send battleships and guns, gunpowder and cannon, and we had to subdue them in order to get the Philippines to consent to become a part of the United States. It is not proposed now that we are going to protect the Philippines by a plebiscite. That is not the proposition. It is proposed to give them one plebiscite. They will be given a plebiscite as to whether they should adopt a constitution and become a self-governing race next year or the year after. That is all provided for. But they are going to wait 12 or 15 years and then decide whether or not this thing can be fixed up, whether they can put a spider in the dumpling in the meantime so that Filipino people will not eat the pie. That is what the plebiscite means. It means 12 or 14 or 15 years of orgy and turmoil

to make it practically impossible for the Filipinos to dare to vote themselves the freedom that they would vote themselves the next year.

Oh, no. It is said we want them to have a little chance to experiment before they finally wind up. Maybe they do. I do not know what kind of experiments they will have, but God help you, Filipinos, if they have 15 years to experiment on you. If you give them 15 years to experiment on you to make you say yes or no, God help you for the next 15 years. I would pray for the mercy of the Almighty for the Filipino people for the next 15 years if the imperialists of Wall Street have that long to try to convince them that they had better not vote for their own independence. God help that people for the next 15 years when they come to cast that vote.

That would be the status we would be under. For 15 years the politics of the Philippine Islands would not be at Manila. The politics of the Philippine Islands for the next 15 years would be under the guiding genius of the investment bankers of New York, who do not care whether they get their money back 1 time, 2 times, 5 times, or 10 times; they will still undertake to get it back 20 times—the race that has never been known to abdicate. My friend the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] said the American flag has never been hauled down from over any country above which it has ever been hauled up, but I can tell my friend from New York that there is another flag that has never been hauled down. There is one class that never abdicates. That is the class of imperial fortunes invested in a foreign land. That is the class that knows nothing except to extract the bone and marrow and blood and sinew of humanity for its own aggrandizement. That is the class that has kept the Philippines under the subjection of America for 32 years when we never had any right to take them and never had any right to keep them. That is the class that never abdicates. Give them 15 years to experiment on the American people! I would rather go and offer myself for the purpose of experimentation by science, to be operated on in any ward in any hospital in the United States, than to be a Filipino experimented with for the next 15 years under this plan.

But again I am off the thread of my story. I intended to discuss this matter historically. I intended to come on up discussing the various amendments. For the benefit of those who came in late and for those who yet remain, let me say I was discussing this matter in this form when I began. First, I was discussing the writing and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and what preceded it. I was next discussing the adoption of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States and the history, so far as it affects the status of the Philippine Islands, of the adoption of those various amendments. Then I intended, and I now intend, to take up the statutes of this country, the important statutes, the science of government as it has been unfolded and constantly expressed through statutory and treaty-made laws of this country, and when I had done that I intended to come back to the argument of the Senator from New York which he began here last fall and completed here yesterday. I had about concluded the first discussion of American acquisition of foreign territory, describing it from the standpoint of the Louisiana Purchase.

I wish now only briefly, at the risk of being trite in my remarks, at the risk of being tiresome, which I am undertaking not to be, to say only as a mode of globular illustration that America did not seek to buy Missouri or North Dakota. All America wanted was Louisiana. She was not after California at that time. She had not heard about California's climate. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The population of California is very, very rapidly increasing by virtue of the removal there of many splendid citizens of Louisiana. They are moving from Louisiana to California.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; but they did that merely to carry the State for the Democratic ticket. They are coming back to Louisiana next fall. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be no demonstrations in the galleries.

Mr. LONG. But Louisiana was the sought-for land. Why? Why, Mr. President, if you go to that land of gladness and sunshine to-day, you will know why America wanted only Louisiana. That was enough for any country at the time. Jefferson, gazing upon that land of sugarcane, tobacco, and cotton, and upon the people whose hearts and minds were bent upon serving the welfare of one another—and occasionally their own welfare—sought only the isle of Louisiana; but, in order to get Louisiana, he was made to relent and to accept North and South Dakota, Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas and other territory, for which the United States paid a very slight, if any, consideration in order that it might take them all in with the balance of the Louisiana Purchase Territory.

Then I had illustrated that it was the army of Jackson that had kept America in possession of Louisiana. Then I had undertaken to show that the same army that Jackson defeated at New Orleans, crossed the Atlantic Ocean and whipped Napoleon at Waterloo, and I had reached that status of our constitutional and historical progress when I broke into an argument on the Filipino question, somewhat out of order at the time.

Additional territory began to be considered. There was Florida, which was left out, with nobody to take care of it except Spain. So we took it in. Then along came Texas. I am sorry my Texas friends are not here to-day. Soldiers from Louisiana went there and assisted in acquiring that territory. The Texans had all the generals; we sent them soldiers. Mr. President, there is not a single Louisianian whose name is recorded as a general in that Texas conflict, but we furnished the sinews and the soldiers in order to carry on that war. We furnished medicines; we even treated Sam Houston and some of his leaders in a charity hospital in New Orleans. The base of operations for freeing the Texans in 1836 was the city of New Orleans, where most of the soldiers, I think, came from. So Texas was taken in, but it was not such an easy matter. There was a great conflict in this country as to whether or not we would take in Texas. In a campaign for President the issue was whether we would or would not annex Texas, and the people in favor of the annexation of Texas won.

I should like now to have the attention of the Senator from California. It was after that trouble had been gone through and we had taken in Texas and had taken in Florida that somebody said, "There is no reason, if we are going to take them in, why we can not take in California."

True, the climate of California had not at that time received its full advertisement. It does not need to be advertised in the Senate. California may need to advertise its fruit products; it may need to advertise its cities and its roads; but there is one thing that California will never again have to advertise, and that is its climate. That, however, had not received its full measure of advertisement at the time California was taken into the Union. So that completes the story of America's vast territories. Area after area was changed from the status of a colony until it became a sovereign State. Louisiana received the status of a State. Then on and on and on until in Roosevelt's administration the remaining Territories, including Arizona and New Mexico, were admitted to statehood to share in the American system of government.

When did this imperialism begin? When did the great policy of Pan Americanism begin? When did it begin to flower and bear fruit? When did this system of taking over peoples to be governed and subjugated by this great country that had fought a war against England in order that there should be the right of self-government begin? Mr. President, we finally reached out to take in such islands as the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and the Virgin Islands.

I am not a constitutional lawyer particularly, and I do not now speak from that standpoint. I have practiced a little law in my lifetime; I made a living for some 16 or 17 years at that practice; but I have never been able yet—and I have read the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States—to understand the contention now made that we have the right to acquire foreign territory.

The Constitution of America is one of restricted authority; in other words, the American Government has no authority whatever except what has been delegated to it by the States. There is no inherent power in the Government of the United States except what is exclusively granted to it by the States forming the American Union; and though I have read the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the articles written by the great students of our law, I have never been able to find in the confines of the Constitution of the United States where we got the right to acquire foreign territory. I do not find it yet. It was a very strange theory of government out of which we finally managed to weave the right to go 10,000 miles away and take over a country with which we were not at war in any sense of the word. But now we are in the Orient.

I was sorry that my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] this morning did not make his speech on the war-debt situation. I really was afraid that the Senate might become a place for confessions had he started the speech which I am going to be here when he makes. The saddest words ever spoken to a country are the words "I told you so." America was advised against the Philippine expedition.

The greatest statesmen of the time told America that it had no right to take over those islands far away in the Pacific. She was advised against the war with Spain, and it could have been avoided, as we could have avoided taking over the Philippine Islands. After rejecting that advice and after having ventured into the Orient unsuccessfully, in 1917 America was told to stay out of Europe. There is many a man in this country to-day who sacrificed his political life because he dared to advise the United States to stay out of that vortex of blood 3,000 miles across the sea. There are many of them who will never be heard of again, but time has vindicated the stand they took. To-day millions and billions of dollars of our money, which we sent across the Atlantic Ocean are lost and the flower of the youth of America sleeps in unmarked graves on account of the great crusade we made to make the world safe for democracy, asking nothing but the right to shed the blood of American manhood, asking nothing but the right to spend and to pauperize the manhood and the womanhood of America, asking only the right to go 3,000 miles away to get in a war. We wound up with a glorious sunrise and every nation for whom we fought and spent our money denouncing the menace and the purpose and the designs of the American people. They would put us in a war over the Philippines if they could. Some of them want a war now. They argue that would be the way to dispose of surplus labor, namely, to have a war, put them to work and kill off the surplus. They want the Philippines held 15 years; they want them held eternally.

I do not think there are many people in the United States who want to go any farther than the Philippines, but I can not say much, Mr. President, for all the latter-day statesmanship in this country which caused this Nation to extend itself into Europe and into the Orient. It got to the point that we did not know where we were using the marines; it got to the point where the marines were kept so regularly in Central America and in South America that when a man saw a marine in the United States he thought he was a stranger. I was asked, when I was seeking to come to the United States Senate, "How are you going to stand on taking care of our investments down in Central and South America?" I did not come to the United States Senate with anybody misunderstanding my position on that question, notwithstanding the fact that a large part of the investment comes from the city of New Orleans, where I live. But the same imperialists want 15 years more to experiment with the Philippines—15 years more to enable

the house of Morgan to experiment with the money it has invested in the Philippine Islands.

We have had about 15 years to experiment with what the house of Morgan invested in Europe, have we not? We allowed them to float in this country foreign bonds which were purchased by American investors; we allowed them to sell foreign bonds all over this country, in many instances war-time bonds; and yet we called this a neutral country. We are to-day allowing them to float foreign bonds that are not worth 10 cents on the dollar; we have allowed this to go on until they have broken and pauperized the American people. And we sent the blood, marrow, and bone of American boys over there in order to make the bonds good which they had sold all over this country.

O Mr. President, this Philippine question brings that situation to our minds very forcefully. When we begin to discuss the war-debt situation we ought to open up the United States Senate for confessions before we go very far. The first thing we ought to do is to have an experience meeting. I remember very well one such meeting down in my section of the country. At an experience meeting we find out how much love there is. There is love until somebody owes some money that he has to pay back.

In one of those experience meetings that I saw held in my own church they called a mourner to the bench, a man who had not been regarded as the kind of neighbor he should have been in that community. They forced him to stand up and state whether or not he loved everybody. After he had stood up and professed that he loved everybody, his son-in-law came in and sat down on the front row, and the old gentleman added, "Nearly everybody." [Laughter.]

If we had an experience meeting of nations to-day to tell the countries that they loved, and they plead their love for America and their love for France and their love for England, the first thing they would have to state would be, "Everybody except the man that I owe something."

That is the situation in which we find ourselves; but some Senators want to go still deeper into these foreign entanglements.

Now I come back to the history of the country. I have gone through the administrations of Jefferson and Madison. I now reach the administration of James Monroe, of Virginia.

I do not recall any amendments to the Constitution that were made during his administration; but it was during the Monroe administration that the famous Monroe doctrine was promulgated, that Europe and Asia and Africa should stay out of America; that America would regard as unfriendly any effort made by any foreign power to establish any colony or possession on the Western Hemisphere.

I do not know whether I quote the words of the Monroe doctrine accurately or not. I do not know whether I have ever read the exact language, but that is something in the neighborhood of it—that America would regard as unfriendly any act of anybody undertaking to establish or set up a foreign government in the Western Hemisphere.

What happened to that? There never was a better saying in equity than that you must come into equity with clean hands. There never was a fairer rule of law on earth than that a man coming into a court must come with his hands clean. What kind of hands has America had to maintain the Monroe doctrine? That doctrine is "America for America," and they had gone that way for a little over a hundred years; and yet when we were crying here that America should be for America, we went off 10,000 miles to take America into Asia!

If it is good philosophy and good morals and good government that America should govern America and keep everybody else out of here, it is good philosophy and good morals and good government that America shall not go somewhere with her hands dripping with the blood of the Philippine patriots who undertook to keep this country from going somewhere when we would not allow them to come here. We have no right on the living earth to do it—no right in morals or in law. We had no right to maintain the Monroe

doctrine with the right hand and with the left hand to reach 10,000 miles into Asia to take over people who were crying for their freedom.

That was the kind of thing of which America was guilty. That was utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of James Monroe—the Monroe doctrine—which is recognized throughout the world.

America can not dig a pit without falling into it herself, just as I reminded my friend from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] the other day:

Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein.

Transformed and translated into common, everyday parlance, that means that chickens come home to roost. So it is with the Philippine question and the territorial integrity to which this country is committed.

Mr. President, have I the right to ask for a quorum? I think we have transacted some business since the last quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has that right.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Dale	Kean	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Davis	Kendrick	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	Keyes	Schuyler
Barbour	Dill	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Fess	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	Logan	Smith
Black	George	Long	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McGill	Stelwer
Borah	Goldsborough	McKellar	Swanson
Broussard	Gore	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkeley	Grammer	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Hale	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hastings	Norbeck	Wagner
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Walcott
Cohen	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Costigan	Howell	Reed	White
Couzens	Hull	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily detained from the Senate in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I called for this quorum myself, as the RECORD will show, because I felt that it was my duty, inasmuch as I felt that I had made some very pertinent remarks.

I had explained the constitutional history of the country up to the administration of President James Monroe. I had undertaken, in replying to the constitutional argument of the Senator from New York, to give a brief survey, a very brief horoscope or picture of the formation and founding of the country, beginning with the adoption of the Constitution of the United States in 1787. When I complete my review of the history of the adoption of the Constitution, showing just how it bears upon this question of territorial aggrandizement, I expect to go back and discuss the settlement of this country prior to the adoption of the Constitution, in order that I may show just how the lawmakers were affected by the landing of the Pilgrims and the settlement of the South, and various other things which impressed the men writing the Declaration of Independence and adopting the Constitution.

I was almost at the point of going back to this previous history when I called for a quorum, because I wanted the Senators who had not heard me discuss the Constitution itself to hear me discuss the fundamentals leading up to the adoption of the Constitution.

Mr. President, when our ancestors landed on this American Continent, they found a people already here. They found the American Indian already preempting the entire American Continent. They found the Choctaws, and the

Iroquois, and the Cherokees, and every other kind of a race and tribe, claiming the ownership and possession of the land. There might have been some excuse for taking possession of the land, but even if there was an excuse, there has always been in our hearts as Americans a certain feeling of the injustice our forefathers did to the people of this continent when they came here and took America away from the Indians.

Some of this country was bought. I believe the Dutch bought the Isle of Manhattan for 60 barrels of whisky, or some such consideration. There was some suggestion a few years ago that they could buy it back for the same consideration now. [Laughter.] Some of the country was bought, at any rate. Then the country was settled, on the shores of the Atlantic, extending up and down from Maine to Georgia. They limited the country to the Mississippi River on the one side and to the Atlantic on the other side. Then steadily they began to creep westward and southward, as I have said, until they took in the State of Louisiana.

Slavery grew up in America, and in order that we may understand the pending question thoroughly, we have to discuss the slave question from its beginning. I regret that it is necessary to take time to discuss the slave question, but the matter of territorial expansion necessarily requires a discussion of the slave question, and I hope Senators will learn something of the slave question not recorded in history.

When the Declaration of Independence was written by Jefferson and Franklin, but mainly by Jefferson, there was written into the Declaration of Independence the statement that the system of slavery was an inhuman system which had been forced upon the American people by King George III. How many of us sitting in the United States Senate to-day know that when the Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson he condemned human slavery, and committed the thirteen Colonies to the declaration that, upon being freed from the rule of the tyrant, King George III, America would never allow slavery to be foisted upon the human race?

The proposal to free the slaves was not first written in 1861 or 1858. The proposal to free the American slave from the slave owner was written by the hand of Thomas Jefferson into the Declaration of Independence, and it was voted out, not solely by the votes of the South, but by the votes of some of the Northeastern States, the citizens of which were engaged in the slave traffic in the South. Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, and the Old Dominion representatives stood to outlaw slavery when the Declaration of Independence was written in 1776. When the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence, it was by a tie vote that they failed to write into the Declaration a provision condemning human slavery in America. Some Senators did not know that before. Jefferson began the agitation, and from that time on undertook to free the black man and the white man. It was a philosophy of Jefferson that there should be no such thing as the buying and selling of humanity in the open market.

We are going to have to go back to Jefferson to free the Philippines. We are not going to be able to do it under Hoover. It can not be done. The Senator from Connecticut has practically said so; at least, that is the way I interpreted his remarks here to-day. We will not be able to free the Philippine Islands and make the Filipinos a free people, if we follow the philosophy of freedom of somebody who is against their being free. Some of us Senators here may be misguided about it, but Mr. Hurley has but one thing in the back of his head in regard to the matter, and that is that he does not think the Philippine Islands ought to be free, and he does not want to see any bill come out of Congress that would mean the freedom of the Philippine Islands. I appeal to my good friends here, like the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Maryland; the only reason why the Secretary of War is agreeing with you to-day is because he thinks he sees loopholes in the measure so that there will be no such thing as the freedom of the Philippine Islands.

If it was not necessary to have a referendum in order to take those islands, why must there be a referendum to turn them loose? If a referendum, or a plebiscite, must be held, for the formation of a government and the adoption of a constitution, why would not a plebiscite taken next year be just as good as one taken 15 years from now?

Mr. President, I am one of the Senators who are going to stand here for the freedom of the Philippine Islands in the next Congress. As a follower of the philosophy of Jefferson, that humanity shall not be bought and sold in the open market, I am not going to let a bill be written here, if I can possibly help it, that will mean that for 15 years the Filipinos are to be subjugated and clubbed until they reach the ballot box and deposit a vote which suits the imperialism of this country. I am not going to leave 13,000,000 people and unborn generations until perhaps the wheels roll around until another imperialist sits in the White House. Then God help the Filipinos when they hold an election for their freedom!

What is meant by an election? An election could be held now if one were desired. One is provided for in the bill now pending. But no, the election is to be held many years hence, perhaps 15 years, perhaps 20 years, from now. It is proposed that the Filipino people be allowed to vote on whether they want to be free or not 15 or 20 years from now, because Mr. Hoover will veto a bill providing otherwise. But he will be in the White House for only 60 or 90 days more.

Let him veto the bill. We are waiting for the sunrise. We are waiting for the next President of the United States. We are waiting for what is coming, not looking to what is going. We can wait here 60 or 90 days, because when Franklin Roosevelt sits in the White House he will sign a bill unequivocally, unquestionably, and honorably granting the Filipinos as easy a way to get out of the clutches of the American imperialists as that by which they were put under their domination.

We will wait until Roosevelt comes into the White House. Thank God, this is the last lame-duck session we will ever have. This is our last lame-duck experience. We will wait. It is not going to take us very long to pass a bill similar to the one now pending when somebody is sitting in the White House who wants the Philippines freed.

We have had a hard time. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes], with the milk of human kindness in his heart, has had a terrible fight in trying to get a bill enacted into law. I know the fight he has had. I know how it is to be steadily under the club of somebody when you are trying to free a suffering people and have worked as hard as has the Senator from Missouri. One feels like yielding and yielding and yielding anything in order to get those people relief. I know how one feels under those circumstances. But if it comes down to the point where there are 9 chances out of 10, or 5 chances out of 10, or 1 chance out of 10, that these people will be cheated out of their right to independence, I propose that we ought to delay the thing until we get somebody in the White House who will stand with us. That is the status.

The followers of Jefferson, the first people who carried the torch against human slavery—the light of Jefferson, with such followers as Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln—the light of Jefferson, that undertook to keep the arm of this country from ever subjugating a people, that undertook to outlaw human slavery from one end of this country to the other—it will take the principles and the successors of Jefferson in the Democratic Party, perhaps, to give the Philippine people the kind of independence which Thomas Jefferson and his kind gave to this country. We can wait 60 days, or 90 days. We can wait and give them real freedom, real liberty. That is probably what we will have to do, and that is what we are prepared to do.

Mr. President, I have seen some funny things going on. The United States Government is not paying me for the privilege of educating me. I sometimes feel that I owe the Government money, I am learning so much more than I ever knew. It is hardly fair to a man that he has to pay for tuition and board, fees and expenses at college in order that

he may learn, and then send someone like myself to the United States Senate to learn so much and get paid for learning it. But I have learned a great deal since I have been here. I do not know how far this knowledge is going to go.

I have almost learned to compromise. I have learned to compromise. I did not get what I thought I ought to get out of the compromise. I learned how to give, but I did not learn how to take. I was learning to compromise. I thought I had learned how to do that back when I was Governor of Louisiana. Most legislation is a result of compromise. You go as far as you can, so long as you can, by good service, sacrificing in order to meet the views and wishes of somebody else. That has been the way I have obtained most of the legislation I have ever had passed. I have yielded to the other man's view as far as I could, and I have yielded in this case. I have yielded to everything except the question of whether we are going to free the Filipinos or not. I yielded on the question of time to some extent and was willing to yield—willing to yield on everything except whether we are or are not going to free the Philippine Islands.

How much of the Philippine industry is owned by American capital? Somebody said America owns a certain per cent. I understand it is a big per cent. I would not undertake to state the exact figures. I believe the sugar industry is owned 19 per cent by Spain, 26 per cent by Filipinos, and the balance by Americans. That would be 55 per cent owned by Americans. We were told by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] that the coconut-oil industry is owned by American people.

I do not want to have to fight two wars in election and two more wars with somebody else to try to get independence for the Philippine Islands. I do not want them to wait for these American syndicates, steadily extending their influence over the employees, adopting such rules of suffrage and election as they want to adopt, allowing such people to register as they want to register, employing qualified voters and discharging them in case they are not in favor of keeping the Philippines under the American flag.

Have you ever tried to buck an election in one of those places where the imperialists hold an election? I have. I have had to buck the imperialist election machinery in my time when it was not half as bad as the imperialist election machinery these people would have to buck. I know how it is. I have gone around to the sawmill camps in Louisiana and have had every man tell me he wanted to vote for me and then waited until the day of election, and I would not get enough votes to wad a shotgun. I know what that kind of business means.

Yet we are asked to let the Filipinos have a right some time about 15 years from now to vote on whether they want freedom or not. Ha! and still Senators say they want them to have their freedom. I do not doubt they want their freedom, but some Senators want the Filipinos to wait 15 years and see then if they want freedom then. "When we get through with you we will take another look at you." We might as well put a gun at the head of a man as to talk about voting his freedom 15 years from to-day! I am surprised at the smart men in this Senate. I am surprised at their talking about waiting 15 years for the Filipinos to take another vote on whether they want independence or not. I am astounded at that kind of philosophy.

Mr. Hoover will not sign the bill without it, said the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. I do not care what Mr. Hoover does. It reminds me of a little poem:

When I asked her to wed, "Go ask father," she said.
And she knew that I knew her father was dead;
And she knew that I knew what a life he had led.
And she knew that I knew what she meant when she said:
"Go ask father!"

[Laughter.]

I do not care what Mr. Hoover does about this so far as I am concerned. I do not care whether he approves and signs the bill or not. It makes no difference to me. I do

not know whether he will be home when the bill gets there. Maybe he will and maybe he will not.

We will wait. We will wait for the light of Thomas Jefferson to shine once more in this country. We will wait for a man who is following in the tracks of the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence and tried to strike human slavery from the face of the American Continent at one blow. If Jefferson had had his way there never would have been a war to free the American slave. He would have been free when the Declaration of Independence was voted by the Continental Congress. History does not tell us about it. Historians have undertaken to see to it that it is not written into the history of the United States. There is no school history to-day that tells us that the Declaration of Independence was written to strike out human slavery, and on a tie vote Jefferson lost the first fight against slavery. That is the fact about the matter.

When Abraham Lincoln came along in 1860 he said that the philosophy and the principles of Jefferson were sound things to follow, and he followed in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson had always been against slavery. Lincoln was a convert. He was converted to the principles of Jefferson against slavery, great man that he was with a heart for humanity. Lincoln saw the correctness of Jefferson's ideal philosophy of human slavery's being banished from this continent. Jefferson was born that way.

Roosevelt will go into the White House on the 4th day of March believing in the logic and in the principles of Jefferson, and then we will call my friend from Missouri [Mr. Hawes] and we will write a bill under the guidance and under the searchlight of a man who wants to do justice and right in the quickest way by the Filipino people. That is what we will do. We will not be working under the sword of Damocles. We will be going along with somebody who is trying to help put this thing through. That is what we will do.

Mr. President, I was undertaking to discuss this matter historically. I had reached the administration of President Monroe. Then came John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. We reached "Old Hickory." We reached the administration of Gen. Andrew Jackson, who undertook to see that America remained a united country. The doctrine of nullification, which Lincoln faced in 1860, was faced by Andrew Jackson when he was President of the United States. When he put the heel of right to the ground he said that the Constitution should and would be preserved, that it should and would be kept right, and he refused to allow the doctrine of nullification to be bandied about and spread about in the American country.

Years later, when Abraham Lincoln became President, what perfect Presidents he had to follow! The great Abraham Lincoln was there, following the philosophy of Jackson, backed by the principles of Jefferson, following that philosophy not only that liberty should not perish, that slaves should be free, but that the Union must and should be kept a Union of sovereign States and proclaiming that a house divided against itself could not stand.

Following the philosophy of Jackson, of Jefferson, Lincoln perpetuated and made immortal the doctrine of anti-imperialism, liberty, freedom, humanity, and a Union of States never to be dissolved. That is all of the philosophy of government. There has been no new thing added to the philosophy of government since the days of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln that amounts to anything to the American people. We have the whole of Magna Charta, the civilization of America, when we include Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln. That is all there is to it. There is nothing else. If Lincoln had been here, we never would have heard about the Philippines. If Jackson had been here, there would never have been any fight in the Bay of Manila. If Jefferson had been here, we never would have had a fleet there.

We had to go a little further. That is not all we had to discard. We have been trying to get some wise statesmen in this country to tell us how to get out of the depression. We have been looking for some sound and sane philosopher,

sitting behind some eggshell department in a college, to look into the heavens and tell us what is for the benefit of this country, or to examine into crystal sphere and see if there is not something down at the bottom of the earth that will disclose the trouble with the country. It is not only as it is in the Philippine question, but it is the same as it was if we delved down into Jackson and into Jefferson and into Lincoln's philosophy. They tell us that we have to keep the wealth of the country distributed in the hands of all the people, and that when we begin concentrating wealth we begin to decay and destroy empires and palaces and homes.

We not only can find that kind of advice, but we were told by that kind of people who know all about it that if we got away from these principles and permitted the wealth of the country to be kept in the hands of a few of the people we were going to get into trouble and ruin a good country. We do not have to be told about history by them. All we have to do is to read the history of any country that has ever risen and fallen. There never yet has been one fallen that did not fall because of the centralization of fortunes in the hands of a few people. With half of the people starving to-day in this country, they want to know how we are going to break this thing up. We are not going to break it up until we break up the large fortunes in this country and stop allowing one man to own more money than 10,000,000 people can spend in 100 years. That is a sound philosophy of government, something that the people can understand.

So it is with the Philippine question. Men here talk about writing a farm relief bill—a relief bill for the American farmer—for what? I do not care whether the Filipinos trade with America or not if it is not to their own interest. If it is not to the interest of the Filipino people to trade with us, I do not care whether they ever spend a dime here or not.

I am in favor of letting the people of the Philippines work out their own destiny. They may not need blue neckties and stiff collars such as we wear in this country; they might look just as well without them. They may not need blue-gaiter shoes, such as we wear here; they might do just as well without them, and I have been told they would. Let those people live under the shining light of the Almighty according to the circumstances and conditions with which they have to wrestle, and let us not try to extend the imperialistic hand of this country and imagine we are the only people who can take care of them. They are better off to-day than our people. The poor Filipinos we are talking about are far better off to-day than are our people in America. They are not being fed, Mr. President, by a dole. I do not mind telling you that there are plenty of people to-day who are just coming around for a little hand-out here and there. Practically all the States have had to get money from the Government, and there are thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of people to-day who have lost all pride, who can not let pride stand in the way of the children they have got to feed and clothe. We have plenty of them to-day being fed from hand to mouth. Yet we are debating about the freedom of the Philippines!

No bill has been offered in the Congress looking to the freedom of the American people. The Filipinos are not the only ones who have got to be freed. There is a form of slavery here that is worse than the Filipinos have. True it is the Philippines have the hand of America controlling them as a possession and they ought to be freed from it; but the men and women of America have got the unmanacled hand of a concentrated element of financiers who, with eyes that can not see and ears that can not hear, insist upon a country where, with too much to eat, people are starving to death; where, with too much to wear, people are naked; where, with too many houses to live in, people are left without places to put their heads at night. That is the kind of slavery we are suffering from in this country—financial slavery, economic slavery, inhuman slavery—the god of greed. We do not need worry about freeing the Filipinos too quickly. I am for freeing them to-night. We should worry about freeing the hands of the people of this country

from the god of greed and the concentration of fortunes in this country in the hands of a few people.

Ah, Mr. President, I would be glad if I could see tears shed on the floor of this Senate in behalf of the people of this country as they have been shed for the poor Filipinos by those who appeared to want to take care of them, but which they would not be doing at all, for they would be putting the poor Filipinos in a worse fix than they are in now. I want to save the Filipinos from getting into the condition in which the common people of America are in to-day. When they are freed, God help that they may not be under the imperialistic control of the financial set that now controls America. God help that when the Philippine Islands are freed the Filipinos will be turned loose like free men and women and children and will not be turned loose under the benighted influence and under such imperialistic conditions as will be imposed upon them in the meantime.

It is said there may be revolution in the Philippine Islands. If there should be any such condition in the Philippine Islands as we have in America to-day there would be revolution. America is the only civilized country on the globe where, with such conditions as prevail here, there would not be a revolution. History has never yet recorded the name of a country whose people were as peaceful as those of America, when 50 per cent of them were starving to death because there was too much to eat, and were naked because there was too much to wear.

I make the statement as a challenge that, beginning with the days of Abraham there has never been a country whose people, when there was two times too much to eat and two times too much to wear and two times too many houses in which to live, and yet the people starved, remained as peaceful as they are in America to-day. Under the shining light of American civilization we have more cotton than we can wear out in three years and more wheat than we can eat in two years, and yet people are naked and hungry. Under such conditions never has there been a generation of people in any clime at any place on earth who were as peaceful as the American people are to-day while they starve.

I remember when I was a child in school I read about the Cannibal Islands where men who got hungry ate the flesh of other men. The thought of a cannibal eating the flesh of another human being seems terrible and revolting, but to-day we allow a thousand or a million people to starve because one or two men have got so much to eat and so much to wear, which they can neither eat nor wear themselves, have got to hold it in their hands and enjoy the starvation and thirst of a million people while the food they have rots on their own hands. God help the Philippines so that they do not get into that kind of a fix. I will help to keep them from getting in the hands of the imperialists of America. God help the poor Filipinos! They have something to eat over there and something to wear and houses in which to live. We have not those things here.

Now, Mr. President, I will return to the constitutional phase of this question. I am very sorry I will not be able to complete my remarks this evening, but there is much to discuss, the question is big, and it brings up so many points. I wonder why it is desired to hold the Philippines for 15 years. I guess they will have a sales tax written up for them pretty soon and various other forms of taxation which under our Government our statesmen and scientists are trying to provide for us. They can protect themselves over there better than we can here the way we are now fixed.

Senators, we have not tried to get independence for the Philippine Islands on any other theory except to free them; that is all. Much has been said about our trying to protect the sugar of Louisiana and of the 17 Western States. It is funny to consider who is indulging in that kind of talk now. Who is it that we hear decrying our efforts to protect the western and southern farmers in America? Some of the distinguished Senators from New England—God save old New England; I love it as much as does anybody on earth, but they have had a tariff for themselves ever since this has been a country—are complaining because the farmers of this country are unable to buy in a protected market

and sell in an unprotected market. When the farmer of Louisiana goes to town and buys a pair of shoes, he pays a tariff on that pair of shoes in order to protect the man in Massachusetts and Connecticut who manufactures them from the competition of the manufacturer across the water; but when the farmer in Louisiana goes to town to sell a sack of sugar he has got to sell it as against the Filipino, who has no such relationship imposed upon him as have the farmers of America.

I should correct that statement, perhaps, for I believe they now have such a relationship, I am sorry to say, but nevertheless they are located 10,000 miles from our shores in a climate so conducive to sugar production that the oriental population there can produce sugar at a price so much below what we produce it for that it is impossible for the American farmer to compete with the Filipinos.

Mr. President, they were not producing sugar until we took them over as a possession; the Philippines were not a sugar-producing country to amount to anything until they became a part of this country. When they were fighting for their freedom and we were fighting to take it away from them they were not producing any sugar. It is only since they have become attached to the United States and have been able to send their sugar here without any tariff at all that they have begun to crush the life out of the American sugar farmer. They are now a part of the possessions of the United States; they can bring their sugar in here without exhausting their quota.

I am not going to argue the tariff question. If Senators want to tear all the tariff down in America, I can talk with them on that basis; if they want to tear all of the tariff walls down and do not want them, very well; but I have not seen anybody sitting in the Senate yet, or at least I do not see anybody sitting here now, who has not voted for some kind of a tariff on some commodity in which his constituents were interested. They make speeches against the tariff, but when it is proposed to impose a tariff on some commodity in which their constituents are interested 9 out of 10 of them vote for the tariff. Of course, they are unselfish; they are not influenced by political considerations and by the interests of their constituents; they are all good Americans; but somehow, somewhere, at some time all it is necessary to do is to propose a tariff on some commodity produced by their constituents which they think needs protection, and there is not any trouble in getting them to line up for it. Every one of us does it; I do it. I can talk with those who say my constituents can sell in an unprotected market and buy in an unprotected market; I can stand with them on that basis; but no one of us thinks that kind of thing is going to be done. We know it is not going to be done. We know that there is no more chance of abolishing tariffs in the United States than there is of chartering a train to the moon. There is no such thing on the horizon, and nobody is advocating any such thing. If that be true, then what are we going to say to the farmer of the West and the farmer of Louisiana who buy their clothes and pay the tariff, who buy their shoes and pay the tariff, why buy their plows and pay the tariff? Are we going to say that the farmer is a selfish, mercenary man, though he is starving to death, and we will not let him have a tariff on what he is raising but will charge him a tariff on what he buys?

There never was, Mr. President, a more unfair thing than to leave the people of this country in the demoralized condition in which they find themselves at this time, and to begin to talk about what we shall do somewhere else. As the Senator from Michigan said the other day, the American farmer is not trying to get the right to sell more than he sold last year or in normal times. This bill, under the amendment I offered and which was adopted by the Senate, gave the Filipinos a right to ship into America more sugar than they shipped in here in good times. When times were good, when we had prosperous days, the Filipinos sold only around 500,000 tons of sugar in America. Up to 1929 they sold something around 600,000 tons of sugar in America. In good times, when the American farmer was selling 17,000,000

bales of cotton, the Filipinos were selling us 600,000 tons of sugar. Now, in these days when the American farmer can not sell even 9,000,000 bales of cotton, or perhaps can not sell even 8,000,000 bales of cotton, you are crying because we are restricting the Filipino to the 600,000 tons that he sold in good times.

We are not asking for normal agriculture. We do not expect that; but when we are on our backs trying to sell our sugar and our cotton and our cottonseed oil, you say to us, "Oh, no! The Filipinos must be allowed to increase their exports to this country." "Why?" "Not to do you any good, but in order that we may discourage them from voting a plebiscite 15 years from now."

We must allow the Filipino to break down the farmer of the South, we must allow him to break down the farmer of the West, by shipping so much coconut oil into this country free of duty that we can not sell cottonseed, and by shipping so much sugar into this country free of duty that we can not sell American sugar. We must let the Filipino go up and up and up and up with the aid of American capital. Why? In the hope that he will produce so much in 15 years that with the imperialist over him he will not vote himself out under a plebiscite and have a free country!

With all the pressure of American capital in there, voting under the whip and the sword of Damocles, there never was a bill framed that would come nearer to defeating Philippine independence than putting them under that kind of a status for 15 years to come.

There is where we find ourselves. That is the condition we are in.

Mr. President, we would like very much to have a vote on these bills. We believe that the Senators understand them to some extent. Some of our men have gone. Some of them have gone to Texas. Some of them have gone elsewhere. There has been a good deal of talk about when we are going to take a vacation this Christmas. Some say we will take 10 days in the Senate and only 3 days in the House. I do not see why it is going to worry the American people how long we are going to take a vacation. The way things are now it is not going to hurt anybody to have us take a pretty good vacation. I do not know but that it would be a pretty good thing for us to take a vacation until March. I would not advocate that right now, but for all the good you are doing I think you can go home now. I think the American people look on this Congress as the nigger did on the lawyer at the time the judge said to him, "Here, Mose, have you got a lawyer?" He said, "No; I ain't got a lawyer." The judge said, "Well, you can take your choice of lawyers. You can take either one of those two men you see over there, or you can take one that has not come yet." The nigger looked at the two lawyers, and said, "Judge, I believe I will take the one that ain't come." [Laughter.]

I believe the people would say that this Congress can go, so far as they are concerned. Here we are, sitting here, with a gentleman in the White House who has a right to do as he sees fit, and who says, "I will not sign the bill; I will veto it if you do this." Here we have the American people who voted for beer all over America. I do not care whether they want beer or not; I want to do whatever they want to do about it. If they want beer, let them have beer. If they want to repeal the eighteenth amendment, let them have it. I have stopped trying to decide the matter for them. I want to let them do what they want to do. I made up my mind that I can not decide the question for them. Here we have an overwhelming expression of the people of the country that they want beer, and yet we are told that the President will veto a beer bill. It is not a question as to whether I want them to make beer or whether he wants them to make beer, but it is a question as to what the American people want to do. If they want to let the States regulate the liquor business, it suits me. I do not care. I only want to let them do what they want to do about it; but we are told that if a beer bill goes to the White House it is going to be vetoed.

If that is the kind of a Government we have; if, after people have voted by seven or eight million majority for

one thing, somebody is going to do the other, what is the use of sitting here trying to pass this kind of a bill? What is the use in it? I do not see any use in it. If we are going to sit here and work and slave and argue and plead and beg and compromise, and think finally we have people agreed on a compromise and then at the last minute somebody says, "You can not do that, because if you do the President will veto the bill," what is the use of going on through with this kind of business?

I do not propose to be under that kind of a lash. I do not want to see anybody else under it. I think thoroughly and fully over these questions as I see them with such light as I have before me. I see only one solution of any of them, and that is for us to pass bills such as we would pass if Franklin D. Roosevelt were in the White House. If Mr. Hoover does not want to sign them, we will just wait until Mr. Roosevelt comes into the White House and then pass them. I hate to delay them. I hate to see the people wait, but nothing else can be done.

When we come to this Philippine bill, however, we are in a worse fix than just waiting. If we should pass a bill here such as some Senators are trying to pass, and we had a right to come back here and pass some other kind of a bill next year, that would be one thing; but if we pass this bill then we are hooked and the American Congress is powerless to change it until the time for the plebiscite has run out and it is voted on. We can not come back again and undo what we have done once we do it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COPELAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand that the Senator does not desire to relinquish the floor.

Mr. LONG. No, sir. I want to discuss this matter for several hours yet.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had hoped we would continue until about 5 o'clock this evening, but, of course, that time is only 20 minutes off.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to going on until 5 o'clock if the Senator insists.

Mr. McNARY. I shall not insist on that course. I do want a session to-morrow, and I think that is the purport of the Senator's motion—to recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. My motion was to recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. McNARY. I intended to make that motion later.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. I will yield to the Senator to make the motion.

Mr. McNARY. No; I am satisfied that we recess at this time, provided we recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. LONG. Then there seems to be no objection, so let us go ahead and recess. It is understood that I shall hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield for a recess.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the recess is taken, I ask unanimous consent to offer and have printed an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD's amendment was, on page 29, after line 13, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(e) The provisions of this section shall apply to any article which now is imported into the United States free of duty under the provisions of existing law, whenever such article shall be made dutiable by the United States.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, December 17, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou High and Holy One, who dwellest in the high and holy places, we thank Thee for Thy manifold deliverances. Help us all, dear Lord, to rise upon the stepping-stones of ourselves, that we may be truly humble and childlike in our sincerity; may our gaze be forward. Do Thou illuminate our thoughts with a sense of Thy guiding presence and evermore abide with us in the common things of life, which are so essential and countless. By the many opportunities at our hands, inspire us with the abundance of our resources and with a deep desire to know how to use them in the interest of all our people. We pray for a better day to come to our own beloved America. O let the breaking light fall upon it and upon this weary, woeful world. Graciously remember all whose memories are sad and who look through a glass darkly. In the holy name of the Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 217. A joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to hold its eighth congress in the United States.

The message announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. SMOOT and Mr. HARRISON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Veterans' Administration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on Tuesday last when the motion was made to table a resolution proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] I was absent in Chicago and, therefore, was recorded as not voting. I rise to state the fact of my absence and to say that if I had been present I would have voted "yea"; in other words, to table the resolution.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL E. GARRETT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very beautiful tribute delivered by the Chaplain of the House, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, on the occasion of the funeral services of the late Representative DANIEL E. GARRETT, of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

To-day Congress has but one heart, and that is sore and heavy. For a score of years this most capable and patriotic statesman and Christian gentleman has been coming in and going out among us. His character equaled his intellect, as great as that was. He always pledged every motive of honor and love to truth and duty and to universal sympathy and helpfulness. Through